

ORGANIZED: THE LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF PLANNING  
ON PERSONAL AND SOCIAL LIFE

BY

CHARLES E. WEAVER, III

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE  
COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
IN PARTIAL  
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1974

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my brother  
William Alexander Brown

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to those persons who have helped in the development of this study. He is especially indebted to Mr. Ralph Kinschlag, Chairman of his Supervisory Committee, under whose direction this thesis took shape. His patient suggestions, criticisms, and patience are gratefully acknowledged.

To Mr. Eugene Hall and Mr. William Alexander, the writer is indebted for their professional interest as members of his Supervisory Committee.

Gratitude is acknowledged to the superintendents of the selected counties for legitimizing the writer's activity there. Because of the meagre nature of the study, they will not be named. Appreciation is also expressed to the staff, principals, teachers, and members of the school boards and community organizations who cooperated so willingly in providing the writer with personal interviews.

To his mother and father and to the mother and father of his wife, the writer expresses his appreciation for their continued interest and well wishes.

Finally, the help given in various ways by the writer's wife, Barbara, is sincerely acknowledged. Her insight, understanding, patience, and love will always be appreciated.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                               | Page |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .                                                     | 12   |
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .                                                      | vi   |
| SUMMARY . . . . .                                                             | viii |
| CHAPTER                                                                       |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .                                                     | 1    |
| Statement of the Problem . . . . .                                            | 5    |
| Justification of the Study . . . . .                                          | 7    |
| Motivation . . . . .                                                          | 8    |
| Definition of Terms . . . . .                                                 | 8    |
| Procedure . . . . .                                                           | 9    |
| Division of School Marketing for Study . . . . .                              | 20   |
| Collection of Data . . . . .                                                  | 24   |
| Instrumentation . . . . .                                                     | 26   |
| Selection of Persons to be Interviewed . . . . .                              | 32   |
| Data Treatment . . . . .                                                      | 33   |
| Organization of the Study by Chapter . . . . .                                | 33   |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .                                    | 15   |
| Reflections of the Process of Planning . . . . .                              | 15   |
| Systematic Planning--Problems . . . . .                                       | 21   |
| Systematic Planning--Advantages . . . . .                                     | 24   |
| Suggestions for Effective Planning . . . . .                                  | 25   |
| Chapter Summary . . . . .                                                     | 32   |
| III. COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN THE SELECTED<br>SCHOOL SCHOOL SYSTEM . . . . . | 45   |
| Introduction . . . . .                                                        | 45   |
| Planning in School System A . . . . .                                         | 46   |
| Initial Activity in Planning . . . . .                                        | 47   |
| Methods for Assignment of Responsibility<br>for Planning . . . . .            | 47   |
| Means of Participation in Planning . . . . .                                  | 48   |
| Comprehensive Planning Committee . . . . .                                    | 53   |
| Division of Planning Functions . . . . .                                      | 53   |
| Plans Made in Comprehensive Planning . . . . .                                | 53   |

|                                                                                        |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Planning in School District B . . . . .                                                | 38  |
| Initial Activity in Planning . . . . .                                                 | 39  |
| Articles for Assignment of Responsibility<br>for Planning . . . . .                    | 40  |
| Extent of Participation in Planning . . . . .                                          | 42  |
| Comprehensive Planning Conditions . . . . .                                            | 42  |
| Overview of Planning Practices . . . . .                                               | 43  |
| State Role in Comprehensive Planning . . . . .                                         | 45  |
| Comparative Analysis of Comprehensive<br>Planning in the School Districts . . . . .    | 47  |
| Chapter Summary and Conclusions . . . . .                                              | 49  |
| IV. COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN THE SELECTED MIDDLE-<br>SIZED SCHOOL DISTRICTS . . . . . | 75  |
| Introduction . . . . .                                                                 | 76  |
| Planning in School District Q . . . . .                                                | 76  |
| Initial Activity in Planning . . . . .                                                 | 76  |
| Articles for Assignment of Responsibility<br>for Planning . . . . .                    | 77  |
| Extent of Participation in Planning . . . . .                                          | 79  |
| Comprehensive Planning Conditions . . . . .                                            | 81  |
| Overview of Planning Practices . . . . .                                               | 82  |
| State Role in Comprehensive Planning . . . . .                                         | 87  |
| Planning in School District R . . . . .                                                | 89  |
| Initial Activity in Planning . . . . .                                                 | 89  |
| Articles for Assignment of Responsibility<br>for Planning . . . . .                    | 90  |
| Extent of Participation in Planning . . . . .                                          | 92  |
| Comprehensive Planning Conditions . . . . .                                            | 93  |
| Overview of Planning Practices . . . . .                                               | 94  |
| State Role in Comprehensive Planning . . . . .                                         | 100 |
| Comparative Analysis of Comprehensive<br>Planning in the School Districts . . . . .    | 109 |
| Chapter Summary and Conclusions . . . . .                                              | 110 |
| V. COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN THE SELECTED LARGE<br>SCHOOL SYSTEMS . . . . .            | 111 |
| Introduction . . . . .                                                                 | 112 |
| Planning in School District S . . . . .                                                | 113 |
| Initial Activity in Planning . . . . .                                                 | 113 |
| Articles for Assignment of Responsibility<br>for Planning . . . . .                    | 114 |
| Extent of Participation in Planning . . . . .                                          | 115 |
| Comprehensive Planning Conditions . . . . .                                            | 116 |
| Overview of Planning Practices . . . . .                                               | 120 |
| State Role in Comprehensive Planning . . . . .                                         | 120 |

## CHAPTER

Page

|                                                                                  |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Planning in School Districts . . . . .                                           | 127 |
| Initial Activity in Planning . . . . .                                           | 130 |
| Widespread Use Assignment of Responsibility<br>for Planning . . . . .            | 130 |
| Extent of Participation in Planning . . . . .                                    | 136 |
| Comprehensive Planning Committee . . . . .                                       | 138 |
| Division of Planning Functions . . . . .                                         | 140 |
| State Role in Comprehensive Planning . . . . .                                   | 143 |
| Comparative Analysis of Committees<br>Planning in the School Districts . . . . . | 144 |
| Chapter Summary and Conclusions . . . . .                                        | 151 |
| <br>VI: SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION . . . . .                           | 154 |
| Findings . . . . .                                                               | 157 |
| Recommendations . . . . .                                                        | 163 |
| <br>APPENDIX A . . . . .                                                         | 171 |
| <br>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                                                       | 175 |
| <br>STATISTICAL TABLES . . . . .                                                 | 178 |

# LIST OF TABLES

| Table                                                      | Page |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Areas Involved in Planning in County A . . . . .        | 49   |
| 2. Statements of Planning Practices in County A . . . . .  | 54   |
| 3. Areas Involved in Planning in County C . . . . .        | 76   |
| 4. Statements of Planning Practices in County C . . . . .  | 86   |
| 5. Areas Involved in Planning in County D . . . . .        | 94   |
| 6. Statements of Planning Practices in County D . . . . .  | 97   |
| 7. Areas Involved in Planning in County E . . . . .        | 117  |
| 8. Statements of Planning Practices in County E . . . . .  | 121  |
| 9. Areas Involved in Planning in County F . . . . .        | 133  |
| 10. Statements of Planning Practices in County F . . . . . | 137  |

Report of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Education

ORGANIZATION FOR COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING  
IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF FLORIDA

By

Charles E. Moore III

August, 1974

Chairman: Dr. Ralph E. Klinebach

Major Department: Educational Administration

The focus of this study was the manner in which planning in six selected school districts in Florida organized and administered cooperative educational planning as mandated and defined by the 1970 Florida Legislature in the enactment of Section 224-04(1), Florida Statutes; its major series of questions gave direction to the study. The first series asked what were the first significant actions taken by superintendents as a result of the planning mandate - the second sought to identify who had been assigned the ultimate responsibility for planning and why - the third inquired as to the extent of participation in planning of the community and various levels in the school system - the fourth asked what committees were formed for the purpose of engaging in comprehensive planning and how they functioned - the fifth examined the extent to which the school districts were engaging in effective or ineffective planning practices - the sixth requested planners to evaluate their involvement in planning and recommend future state action.

The ten largest, ten midsize-sized, and the ten smallest school systems in the state were selected for study. The largest school system served approximately 241,000 students in some 240 schools and the smallest school system enrolled less than 700 students in one school. Data were collected by examination of school-district comprehensive educational planning documents, and interviews. Persons interviewed included school board members, superintendents, school district office-level administrators, school-level administrators, teachers, and members of the community. The data were reported in the main study's chapters in the sequence of the interview guide. Additionally, school districts of similar size were subjected to comparative analysis.

The findings were as follows:

The most frequently identified local planning action was the superintendent's appointment of a key staff member to coordinate and assume ultimate responsibility for planning. Other significant initial actions included the appointment of outside planning consultants, and the participation of local planners with state department officials in developing state-wide planning specifications.

Comprehensive planning responsibility was consistently assigned to persons close to the superintendent who headed or were affiliated with the district instructional division.

School-level school officers delegated the organization and implementation of comprehensive planning to the organizational year groups and members of the community participating by fulfilling specialized planning assignments that were performed by school district-level staff. These assignments included, the administering of

needs assessment surveys; (3) setting of organizational plans; the setting of policy objectives and strategies, and reacting to reports and surveys provided by system-level planners;

Committees were formed to function in the planning system, but did not function in a comprehensive manner in comprehensive planning. Within committees, when formed, functioned mainly by reacting to demands provided by system-level planners.

When compared to selected statements of education and ineffective planning practices, all of the school districts investigated were found to be engaging in a variety of productive and unproductive planning activities. A portion of planning potential was lost because: relevant data was not provided to planners on the school level, communication was inhibited by the use of technical jargon in the orientation process, a sophisticated system of feedback was not provided, decision-making was centralized, and the atmosphere of planning was not perceived by all planners as being democratic.

State influence and assistance in planning was unsatisfactory. Written materials, regional planning sessions, and visits provided by the State Department of Education did not provide the amount and level of planning assistance needed in the organizational year of national planning. School-district planners recommended that the State Department play a strategic advisory, consultative, and supportive role and either hire or develop more sophisticated planning consultants.

## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

One of the contemporary issues in the field of education is educational planning. In the past several years, systematic management tools such as MBO (management by objectives)<sup>1</sup> and PMP (planning, programming and budgeting systems)<sup>2</sup> have been modified to fit the particular circumstances of educational organizations. This "new" systematic planning emphasizes measurement of inputs and outputs, accountability for results, and a long-term perspective. Experts state that the understanding of interest in educational planning was caused by pressures for change, for efficiency and effectiveness, and for accountability which has resulted in: "... an expansion of the planning concept, modifications in planning approaches, and the development of more sophisticated planning technology."<sup>3</sup>

In 1972, the Legislature of the State of Florida modified the state policy by expanding the school district management program to third class programs and all funds of the school district were included in a

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter F. Drucker, Managing for Results (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Stephen E. Hammerish, Planning, Programming, and Budgeting, California: McGraw-Hill Publishing Corporation, 1973, p. 388.

<sup>3</sup> R. A. Brown, "Educational Planning," Managing Schools, Ed-400 (Hawthorn, 1973), 18.

curriculum district plan. This was accomplished by the enactment of Section 226.02(4) of the Florida Statutes which reads as follows:

(4) COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN REQUIRED. --

(a) Each district school board shall maintain an ongoing systematic evaluation of the educational program needs in this district and shall develop a comprehensive annual and long-range plan for meeting those needs, both on an annual and long-range basis, as prescribed by §§ 226.13(5) and 226.21(4).

(b) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the state board, each school board shall annually submit to the department of education that district's annual and long-range plan. Each plan shall reflect a structured program of action for meeting the educational needs of the district over a period of not less than five years and shall contain specific goals and objectives which are consistent with the state goals for education.

(c) The department of education shall review each district plan and may recommendations for its approval to the district school board.<sup>4</sup>

To explain the legislature's intent for comprehensive educational planning, the State Department of Education issued a document entitled Guidelines for District Comprehensive Educational Planning to all school districts.<sup>5</sup> This document did not demand that any particular planning model such as FORD or SRA be used by school district planners, but allowed the planners in each district to use any planning model they found to be adequate and effective in meeting the requirements of the statute, and the regulations of the Department of Education. The Department of Education

<sup>4</sup>Florida Statutes, 1974 Supplement (Challabourn - State of Florida, 1974), pp. 244-245.

<sup>5</sup>Guidelines for District Comprehensive Educational Planning (Challabourn, Florida State Department of Education, 1973-74).

require that each school district include in its comprehensive planning process at least the following:

1. Procedures to ensure that it has based its determination of priority program needs, and the allocation of resources for meeting those needs, on the basis of comprehensive needs assessment and evaluation efforts;
2. Procedures to monitor and support the district's planning for program expansion and the concept of providing greater flexibility to those who operate educational programs, but at the same time holding them more responsible for the results;
3. Procedures to ensure that all programs and all funds are included in its annual plan;
4. Procedures to ensure appropriate involvement of representatives, or a reasonable cross section of professional and nonprofessional staff of the district board and the public of the district;
5. Procedures to develop a comprehensive program evaluation design for determining, on a periodic basis, the annual programs the district is funding based on specific objectives with design should be capable of providing continuous evaluation during the span of plans as well as annual sensitive data.<sup>4</sup>

Now, in Tallahassee, the Florida State Department of Education

explained that Section 124-0071 of the Florida Statutes requires that each district:

1. Shall maintain an existing systematic evaluation of the educational program cycle in that district;
2. Shall develop a comprehensive annual and long-range plan for meeting the identified needs on both an annual and long-range basis (at least five years);
3. Shall develop a structured program of action for meeting the educational needs of the district over a period of not less than five years;

---

<sup>4</sup>Tallahassee, pp. 8-9

6. Shall adopt district goals and objectives which are consistent with state goals for education.
7. Shall annually report to the Department of Education that district's annual and long-range plan.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, in 1973 the Florida State Department of Education and the Florida Legislature were acting in effect, "everybody on plan" and the Department of Education provided broad and flexible guidelines for the process. Although the state officials did not provide a detailed plan, they possibly would like to be in a position to recommend one in the future as evidenced in the following statement from Ballentine:

Because of the Department of Education's strong commitment to planning, integration and innovation for each district to discover, design and develop the planning and management procedures best suited to meeting the educational needs of the district, all reports currently required by state and federal programs will be combined. In school district and state working together developing systematic procedures for planning, implementing and evaluating programs in a coordinated, comprehensive manner, decisions can be made in appropriate areas to be standardized in the content and format of the district plan to eliminate separate reports for state or federal programs.<sup>2</sup>

Further, the Florida Legislature and the Florida State Department of Education intend that the comprehensive planning process include activities that assess past performance and expected future results. Florida school districts are called upon to, "... maintain an ongoing systematic evaluation of the educational program needs..."<sup>3</sup> This needs assessment should involve:

$$T_{\text{total}} = T_1 + T_2 + \dots + T_n$$

$$R_{\text{total}} = R_1 + R_2 + \dots + R_n$$

$$S_{\text{total}} = S_1 + S_2 + \dots + S_n$$

... the analysis and use of all data available to the school district such as the results of district-wide standardized testing programs; needs assessment studies; findings of national forms of staff reviews and program studies; Census Reports; recommendations of examining, state and national, associations regarding cost effectiveness reports; financial status studies; and management reviews.<sup>10</sup>

To guide districts in accomplishing the various comprehensive planning requirements, the Florida State Department of Education adopted an official membership role which was, "to provide greater flexibility to those who operate educational programs, but at the same time make them more accountable for results."<sup>11</sup> This was the rationale that allowed planners in each district to use any planning model they wished.

Accordingly, none of the district comprehensive plans would be 'voted' at the state level. The Department of Education would review each plan and make recommendations in terms of the adequacy of the planning procedures, the extent of documentation, the types of decisions resulting from the planning, and the management procedures used to reach the educational needs of the district.

The criteria for planning as stated in the state guidelines have variations of change strategy, accountability, and systems approaches; however, the general statement is to allow local leaders to use their initiative in developing the models or plans until the Department of Education can make decisions on aspects of the comprehensive planning process that can be standardized. Existing planning operations of the districts is being rolled open. This operation has been implemented by the Department of Education in the following ways:

<sup>10</sup>Florida Department of Education, p. 4.

<sup>11</sup>ibid.

1. Development of each district's educational planners to the state committee that produced Guidelines.
2. Furnishing all school districts with copies of Guidelines.
3. Organization of regional Comprehensive Educational Planning sessions. These sessions are held in the five Departments of Education regional planning areas of the state and involve only school districts which are located in the respective regional planning areas. These sessions are one or two days in length, and deal with the exchange of ideas of the planners from the several districts, examination of other districts' comprehensive educational planning efforts or experiences, plus discussion with Department of Education officials.
4. Provision of the Florida Department of Education Planning Model Handbook (see page 17).
5. Visits to designated school districts upon request. In addition to regularly scheduled visits.

There are, of course, not all of the services provided by the Department of Education, but they are the main ones in terms of comprehensive planning. There are still just supplements to planning and some of them do the actual planning for the districts.

### History of the Program

Since comprehensive educational planning as mandated by the 1978 Florida Legislature was a new and rather extensive program, various questions arose concerning how the school districts organized to meet state demands. Were there differences in the way the program was administered? This study was undertaken to obtain the data about the comprehensive planning process in six selected school districts.

iii

<sup>11</sup>William Freneman, Florida Department of Education Planning Model Handbook (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1979).

### Justification of the Study

Due to increasing amounts of state funding, the state of planning, management, and implementation may become the primary resources which will be provided by the local school districts.<sup>13</sup> Comprehensive educational planning as a process is relatively new, school districts have reportedly taken their cue from the Department of Education when complying with statutes or regulations in the past. Comprehensive planning guidelines, in contrast, are broad and flexible.

This study was needed to describe a series of planning patterns that emerged in selected school districts and which were influencing their local initiative in the organization and administration of comprehensive educational planning. Since school districts will be involved in preparing and updating comprehensive plans at least through 1980,<sup>14</sup> the examination of the planning practices of the selected school districts should be of help.

Further justification for this study is the examination of the literature with presentation of the advantages and problems inherent in systematic planning approaches. Such an examination is especially relevant at this time when the Florida State Department of Education and a number of school districts have begun to implement a variety of systems approaches to planning and have had varying degrees of satisfaction with

---

<sup>13</sup>See L. Cohen, Gary Alexander, and E. Foshin Jordan, Planning, Management, Policy and Legal Alternatives, Krieger, Gary Martin & Merrill Publishing Company, 1981, p. 126.

<sup>14</sup>Statute, § 34.

work approaches). The variety of planning systems presently in use by Florida school districts includes Duval County's S.A.P.E. System (Strategic Analysis for Education), Gadsden County's S.A.P.E. (Planning, Programming and Evaluation) System, Broward County's S.A.P.E. (Strategic Evaluation and Review Techniques), and Alachua County's S.A.P.E. (Short Analysis Management Information System). Now that various school districts are successfully evaluating or discarding systematic planning systems, such an updated review of planning literature is needed.

The state has required that comprehensive educational planning be done, but is unwilling to supply any set board and Florida guidelines. This study has provided information that should aid the Florida legislators and the Department of Education as they go about modifying legislation and the role of the Florida State Department of Education in relation to comprehensive educational planning.

### Limitations

The study was confined to six school districts in Florida. The gathering of data was limited to personal interviews and the examination of the comprehensive planning document of each district.

Perhaps the most serious limitation was the historical perspective of the study. Interviewees were asked to talk of the organization and administration of comprehensive planning of a year past.

### Definition of Terms

#### Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan is the document or product of the ongoing comprehensive planning process that

which pair is submitted to the Florida State Department of Education in partial fulfillment of Section 224.02(1)(b) of the Florida Statutes.<sup>15</sup>

### Comprehensive Planning and Comprehensive Educational Planning

Comprehensive planning and comprehensive educational planning is the activity that began subsequent to Section 224.02(1)(b) of the Florida Statutes and which continues as an ongoing process having for its product the district comprehensive planning document. Comprehensive planning is characterized by broad involvement, long and short-range time perspectives, and the application of systematic planning techniques.<sup>16</sup>

### Comprehensive Planning Committee

A comprehensive planning committee is one which was formed either as an effort or pursuant to the purpose of taking place in comprehensive planning.

### Regional Comprehensive Planning Seminars

Regional comprehensive planning seminars are seminars organized by the Florida State Department of Education. They are held in five regional planning areas stipulated by the Florida State Department of Education, and involve the school systems in each of these areas. The purpose of these regional seminars are to clarify the legislative intent for comprehensive educational planning, clarify Department of Education requirements, and to provide a situation in which school districts can compare their comprehensive planning activities and documents.

## Methods

In conducting this study, the writer selected six school districts in Florida for intensive description. The data were collected through personal interviews. Each school district was treated as a case study. School districts of similar size were subjected to comparative analysis.

<sup>15</sup>Florida Statutes.

<sup>16</sup>Florida Statutes, 224.02(1)(b), p. 814.

<sup>17</sup>Id., p. 814.

### Selection of School Districts for study

School districts were selected on the basis of population, the two largest school districts, the two smallest school districts, and ten medium-sized school districts in Florida were selected for study.

### Collection of Data

From ten to two interviews were required in the selected districts, the number varying with school district size, organization for comprehensive planning, and the availability of persons to be interviewed. Data were obtained through personal interviews with persons involved in the comprehensive planning process.

### Interviewing

Through a review of the literature, an interview guide was constructed by the writer. A copy of the guide is presented in Appendix B.

#### I. Interviews were required in six major categories:

1. Initial Activity in Planning
2. Estimates for Assignment of Responsibility for Planning
3. Detail of Participation in Planning
4. Comprehensive Planning Conditions
5. Overview of Planning Activities
6. State Role in Comprehensive Planning

A series of interview questions was asked to determine:

- (1) The date significant action that was taken by the school district as a result of the adoption of Section 604 (2)(c) Florida Statutes; (2) who in the school district was given the ultimate responsibility for the protection of the interests of students that was committed to the Florida

State Department of Education; and (3) which division of the county-level offices was given the ultimate responsibility for producing the demand or proposal.

The next group of interview questions was asked to determine: (1) why the person who/for (2) division identified in the previous series of questions had been given the ultimate responsibility for comprehensive planning; (2) all the planning involved county-level officials, individual schools, members of the community, teachers, students, employee organizations, community organizations, and other areas; (3) the major functions and responsibilities of the above areas that were said to be involved, and (4) the nature or extent of involvement in interviews were asked to respond "yes" or "no" concerning involvement of county-level officials, individual schools, etc.. The percentages of responses were recorded and appear in table form accompanying the case studies of all but one school division for the purpose of displaying the reported extent of involvement of these areas.

Seven interview questions were asked to determine: (1) what committees were formed for the purpose of engaging in comprehensive educational planning; (2) how they were formed; (3) what elements of the community were represented in them; (4) how the school system participated in the planning that was done by the various comprehensive planning committees (if one was identified); (5) in what types of activities they engaged; (6) for what period of calendar time they functioned; and (7) what they were told concerning the nature or authority of the committee or committees.

A review of ten interview statements was made to determine the degree to which the district was using effective planning organization. The statements in this section were written as a result of an examination of the literature on educational planning. A copy of the interview guide is shown in Appendix A. Respondents were asked to react to these interview statements by qualifying each as "an exact description," "a partial description," or "not a description" of what occurred. For example, interview statement 17 is, "Released time was provided for staff members." If the respondent indicated that this was "an exact description" of what occurred, the indication would be that the district was engaged in effective planning practice. The percentage of responses to each of these interview statements appears in table four accompanying all case studies except one.

A third group of four interview questions was asked to determine: (1) the degree of usefulness of the Florida State Department of Education's publication of Guidelines for District Comprehensive Educational Planning; (2) the degree of usefulness of the regional comprehensive educational planning seminars conducted by the Florida State Department of Education; (3) the degree of usefulness of visits to the school district by the Florida State Department of Education officials concerned with comprehensive educational planning, and (4) the role the respondents would like for the department of Education to play in future district comprehensive educational planning.

#### Reliability of Findings in an Interviewed

Representatives of the selected agencies were interviewed and asked to identify the individual to whom the ultimate responsibility for

comprehensive educational planning had been adopted. The researcher interviewed those persons in each of the selected districts and in the process of the interview obtained the names of other persons in the districts who were involved in the process. In each of the selected districts, the person who had ultimate responsibility for the planning assisted in obtaining interviews. Persons interviewed included superintendents, school board members, community-level staff, business principals, teachers, and members of community organizations. Each case study is provided by a list of the titles of those interviewed.

### Data Synthesis

The data collected from each district were organized in the form of a case study and organized in the sequence of the interview guide. From the responses to the interview statements, the writer presented in narrative form the reported organization and administration of comprehensive educational planning in the districts. Illustration of the reported procedures as well as recurring opinions were provided. Some of the actual statements of interviewees also appear.

### Synopsis of the Study by Chapter

Chapter I includes the statement of the problem, justification of the study, limitations, definition of terms, procedures, collection of data, selection of persons to be interviewed, and data synthesis.

A review of related literature is presented in Chapter II.

Chapter III contains data collected about comprehensive planning in the two small districts in the study.

The planning process in the selected middle-sized districts is discussed in Chapter IV.

Chapter V presents a discussion of comprehensive planning in two large school systems.

Chapter VI presents a summary, findings and discussion.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The areas in the literature on planning that have been significantly related to comprehensive educational planning are: (I) definitions of the process of planning, (II) systematic planning--problems, (III) systematic planning--advantages, and (IV) suggestions for effective planning. The review of the literature includes these areas:

#### Definitions of the Process of Planning

Following the practice of many writers in the field of planning, the Florida State Department of Education begins the Foreword of Guidelines for Effective Comprehensive Educational Planning by providing a definition for planning. The Department of Education defines planning as, " . . . the process through which objectives are established and resources are allocated in a manner which optimizes the attainment of these objectives in a predetermined schedule."<sup>1</sup> Greenfield says that we generally view by planning, " . . . selecting educational objectives, implementing programs to achieve them, and determining the actual results."<sup>2</sup> Both of these definitions are concerned with the setting of

---

<sup>1</sup>Guidelines, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>Dr. Harry Greenfield, "Selecting Educational Objectives, Programs and Resources: Policy Analysis for School Systems," The Planning Journal, A Systemic Approach for School Systems, 3: 41-49 (1967) and David P. Phillips, and (Gordon) Gordon Phillips, For Studies in Education, 1971, p. 36.

objectives in a most direct and efficient manner. Decisions are reached with the following definition of planning:

Educational planning is the broadest possible term for the application of rational systematic analysis to the process of educational development with the aim of making operating plans effective and efficient in response to the needs and goals of the individual and society.<sup>3</sup>

A more simplistic definition of planning as offered by Brian and Johnston, " . . . planning can be viewed as encompassing all of those activities that are necessary to produce from inception of an idea to the decision and evaluation in practice."<sup>4</sup> Karsavols and Gier offer identical definitions. For them, "Planning is the process of preparing a set of decisions for action in the future, directed at achieving goals by optimal means."<sup>5,6</sup>

Gier elaborates on the seven elements contained in this definition:

### 1. Planning is the Process

Planning is a process, i.e., a continuous activity taking place within a unit and requiring some input of resources and energy in order to be more fruitful. Planning is a process must be distinguished from a "plan." A "plan" can be defined as "a set of

<sup>3</sup>Myers, p. 20.

<sup>4</sup>Frederic Brian and E. D. Johnston, "Planning and Problems of Planning," Public Administration Review, April, 1972, 28.

<sup>5</sup>Karsavols, p. 126.

<sup>6</sup>Edmund Gier, "Policy Analysis: A New Professional Role in Government Service," Public Administration Review, April, 1972, 221.

decisions for action in the future" and can be arrived at either through planning, or through some other--rational or irrational--method of decision-making.

#### 2. Of Proposals

Planning is substantively--and in most cases, also formally and legally--a process of proposing a set of decisions to be approved and executed by some other agency. Even if the same unit makes planning decisions with authority to approve and execute, there are still, though interdependent, processes which must be kept analytically separate.

#### 3. A Set

It is very important to emphasize the difference between planning and decision-making in general. While planning is a kind of decision-making, its specific characteristics in this respect lie in its dealing with a set of decisions, i.e., a matrix of interdependence and temporal stream of systematically related decisions.

#### 4. Of Decisions for Action

Planning is generally directed at actions and not at other objectives, such as pure knowledge, development of the planners and so on. Planning does in fact have various secondary results, such as normative development, better decision-making, learning in decisions, etc., but as long as these results are only secondary objectives, the planning function is not impaired. In fact, it is true that often a planning activity is engaged in as a device to mobilize support, improve public relations, and so on. If this is the case, the process is not planning in its full sense and the actual priority in such cases will depend in some measure from the characteristics and phases of the non 'pure type' planning process, as defined by us, which is essentially "action" or "outcome" oriented.

#### 5. In the Future

Nearly all definitions emphasize that planning is directed towards the future. This is perhaps the most important characteristic of planning, encompassing the elements of prediction and uncertainty and conditioning all aspects, policies and features of planning.

## 4. Direction of Achieving Goals

The planning process cannot operate unless it has some at least defined goals to the achievement of which the recommendations for action on the future are directed. This fact will mean that the planning process begins to operate with clearly defined objectives-- defined, in most cases, the first phase of the planning process equates to the formulation of operational planning objectives in the form of either subsequent and undefined goals not before the planning process by any other, in most cases "policy," processes.

## 5. By Optimal Means

The very nature of planning, in a process for optimal shaping of the future according to our desires, depends on the end-means relationship, which is basic to the planning process. The planning process is directed at supporting the optimal means for achieving our goals, i.e., at selecting on the basis of rational processes-- including collection of information, utilization of knowledge, systematic and interpretive data processing, etc.,--the optimal strategy for achieving the desired goals. The basic question of planning methods, procedures and techniques, is provision of ways for identification of those optimal means with a minimum of input of resources.<sup>3</sup>

Another complex approach to defining educational planning is set out by Humphreys and Traill. They define educational planning in general, economic, physical, social, and administrative terms. The general economic definition of planning reportedly encompasses the development of theory and techniques, and draws upon state, regional, and federal educational plans in broad quantitative terms. "A definition of education in physical terms would cover a time span of from five to twenty years and deal with such things as school buildings, environmental

<sup>3</sup>ibid., pp. 202-203

efficiency, and curricular questions. Reflecting educational planning in social terms would result from surveys reflecting people's wants, curriculum planning, and planning strategy that encouraged personnel and social laboratories, and an administrative definition of planning would reflect issues in developmental control, decision-making, management and operations, laboratory control, implementation planning, and school plant services.<sup>2</sup>

The Florida State Department of Education's planning model. Mobilizationalism best indicates that planning consists of the four major steps of: (1) needs assessment, (2) programming, (3) implementation, and (4) evaluation.<sup>3</sup> Activities in the needs assessment step include the writing of philosophy and goals, long-term objective statements, vision descriptive statements, and derived need statements. In the programming step, needs are related in terms of priority. For example, short-term objective and evaluation statements are made in terms of desirability and measurable outcomes that, if achieved, will reduce or eliminate identified priority needs, and then a selection is made of the most effective strategies for achieving needs. Implementation consists of implementing and evaluating the relationship between philosophy and outcomes. Evaluation is the process by which the results of evaluation are used to decide if mobilizationalism is necessary for the long-term objective statements, priority statements of needs, short-

<sup>2</sup>Frank W. Thompson and Albert Hall, Administrative Planning (London: Collins-Blackie Limited, 1970), pp. 4-5.

<sup>3</sup>Planning for Change (Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education, 1970), p. 2-4.

form and evaluation statements, and for the proposal and selection of alternatives.

After offering several definitions of planning, Ingram makes a distinction between first and second generation planning. First generation planning's distinguishing characteristics is said to be its emphasis on inputs and outputs models. It is primarily concerned with providing funds, facilities and services. Second generation planning is described by Ingram as placing greater emphasis on goals and outputs and alternative means for reaching those goals or producing those outputs. Examples of second generation planning are plans as cost-effectiveness programs, planning and management information systems, simulation programs, and system analysis procedures.<sup>10</sup>

The literature indicates that:

1. Planning is a process that is ongoing.
2. Planning is concerned with decision-making.
3. Planning results in resource allocation.
4. The assessment of needs is necessary for effective planning.
5. Planning draws enlightenment from the past in preparing for action in the future.
6. Planning is concerned with goals and objectives.
7. Planning is concerned with the selection of the most effective alternative for reaching goals and objectives.
8. Contemporary planning places greater emphasis on goals and outputs than did planning of an earlier time.
9. Planning can include a variety of time spans.

---

<sup>10</sup>Ingram, p. 11.

10. Contemporary planning generally is thought of as a rational and systematic process dealing in a systematic way with resources, decisions, and alternatives.

### Systematic Planning--System

Systematic, rational planning dealing with the selection of alternatives and with resource allocation is thought to be, or at least implied to be, a completely new approach. Ingers warns that presenting such ideas as absolutely new when they are merely a modification of an old principle may lead to the rejection of planning. "When this is discovered by the user, he feels deceived and thus might reject the innovation."<sup>11</sup> Even Wilens, "There is nothing new in a system approach. We have all been exposed to and have practiced the three strategies of planning, organization and control,"<sup>12</sup> Even Berick, who is given much of the credit for the present emphasis on systematic planning, has stated, "... certain elements of program budgeting are as old as civilization,"<sup>13</sup> "where and whenever track planning is," "... the days of history,"<sup>14</sup> and Berick and Lowmyer believe, "... The earliest example of comprehensive planning in education is to be found in The English where Plato proposes a well-articulated scheme which takes account of the political needs of the city-state as he saw them--about

<sup>11</sup>Ingers, p. 10.

<sup>12</sup>R. L. G. Jones, "Program Budgeting: Hope or Hype?" Administrative Science, 81-82 (December, 1974), 22.

<sup>13</sup>Berick, p. 14.

<sup>14</sup>Berick and Lowmyer, p. 10.

when the school the network of society.<sup>15</sup> Several of these authors bother to add, however, that it is a mistaken argument that there is nothing new in the idea of educational planning and they are profound differences in historical and contemporary planning schemes. Nevertheless, for example, states that persons who argue that there is nothing radically new in the system approach to planning are referring to particular elements within the technique and not the complete set of ideas.<sup>16</sup>

In addition to demonstrating weaknesses because of being said to be a completely new approach, systematic educational planning has a number of other problems. Hence, Jackson and Johnson, who believe and debate discuss the desirability of attempting to engage in planning when believed that that such planning is not provided by the school system. Hence, for example, state that the development of a detailed taxonomy of objectives is a complicated ongoing process (involving a transactive model of state time).<sup>17</sup> Jackson and Johnson report that most school systems are aware of this but are unwilling or unable to provide the distinct time.<sup>18</sup> Accordingly, this involves in, " . . . poorly stated objectives, unclear program structures, [and] inadequate coding for subjects."<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup>W. B. F. Jackson and P. H. Johnson, eds. *J. Educational Planning* (New York: Praeger Press and World, 1977), p. 1.

<sup>16</sup>Marshall, p. 18.

<sup>17</sup>John B. White, "Program Scheduling: How or How Often?" *School and Community*, 1:1 (February, 1972), 28.

<sup>18</sup>W. B. Jackson and P. H. Johnson, "The Fickleness of FPEP," *School Community*, NYC January, 1973, 6.

<sup>19</sup>White and Jackson, p. 28.

Staff and community organizations also contribute a feedback to educational planning. While acknowledging this as the best-possible technique used to introduce systematic planning to school districts,<sup>18</sup> Wilson and Johnson note that the implementation of a system concept may remain hypothetical, conflicts and community resistance. "Not all districts will meet their objectives and accomplishments for lack of funds" agreed.<sup>19</sup> Craft sees the possibility of one person or group of persons causing conflict by being more expert in the planning process than those with whom they work.<sup>20</sup> Further comments on the tendency of the implementation of many persons in the planning process to create dissent.<sup>21</sup> Craft says, "The hurdle that has to be cleared in implementing a system approach is that of 'resistance to change.'"<sup>22</sup> He describes as a hurdle the idea that people will readily adapt to a system approach to educational planning. Wilson and Johnson say that the dissemination of information about planning has not been a problem, but, "...there is, with anything new, some resistance to change of established procedures."<sup>23</sup> They refer to outgrowing systems created before planning, "...

<sup>18</sup>Donald B. Smith, "The Software System in Education," *Public Schools Forum*, LXX (September, 1971), 44.

<sup>19</sup>Wilson and Johnson, p. 8.

<sup>20</sup>John C. Craft, "Organization Development and the Planning Process," *The Planning Process: A System Perspective for School Leaders*, p. 74.

<sup>21</sup>J. W. Roberts, *Planning Systems for School Improvement* (Harcourt) (South-Western Publishers, 1971), p. 161.

<sup>22</sup>Smith, p. 44.

<sup>23</sup>Wilson and Johnson, p. 14.

remains a very undisciplined and unreliable process in the hands of many teachers.<sup>18</sup> Mewertip states that school system difficulties with system approaches to planning arise in large part because the public, the school boards, the profession, and the administrators, as well as other organizations and groups, have not given sufficient thought to the kind of education they want and have not taken the time or devoted the money to a determination of the aims and objective goals or purposes for the educational enterprise.<sup>19</sup>

Another problem of the process of systematic planning is reported to be in the area of measurement and evaluation. Mewertip criticized school system's weaknesses of goals and objectives as being difficult to measure.<sup>20</sup> Several authors feel that greater emphasis is being placed on evaluation in school districts, but a systematic approach is not being followed.<sup>21, 22, 23</sup> As Jenkins and Lefkowitz put it, systematic planning requires: "... analysis of appropriate objectives, of likely alternatives, of differing scales of effort or criteria for decision-making."<sup>24</sup> They further state,

<sup>18</sup> Mewertip, p. 21.

<sup>19</sup> Jack A. Mewertip, "Achieving Accountability: A Word of Caution," The Education Forum: A System Perspective for School Boards, p. 56.

<sup>20</sup> Mewertip, p. 261.

<sup>21</sup> Jones, p. 18.

<sup>22</sup> Mewertip, p. 26.

<sup>23</sup> Jenkins and Lefkowitz, p. 26.

<sup>24</sup> Jenkins and Lefkowitz, p. 2.

system analysis techniques such as multicriteria analysis, have limitations which are compounded by the fact that many educational benefits are immeasurable. While school costs are easily quantifiable, educational benefits (intellectual and mental) are not.<sup>21</sup>

Centralization of decision-making becomes a problem in educational planning as growing school districts make greater use of data banks and other computerized devices. Kaplan explains that such centralization of decision-making tends to reinforce benefits of the isolation from the rest of the system. As it is seen as a threat by other structures in the system, the centralized unit is further isolated and has little impact on the organization.<sup>22</sup> This may result in the upper levels of the school system establishing policy for the lower levels.<sup>23</sup> Jackson and Johnson say that such centralization, " . . . in effect is upon the distance between centralization and decentralization since decentralization and the right to dissent will be limited."<sup>24</sup>

The use of special technology or jargon is reported as another obstacle to systematic planning. Brown and Johnston criticized the approach on the part of some persons that planning jargon creates barriers.<sup>25</sup> Brownish supplies a six-stage planning of how he was in developing

<sup>21</sup> ibid.

<sup>22</sup> ibid., p. 16.

<sup>23</sup> ibid., p. 17.

<sup>24</sup> Jackson and Johnson, p. 1.

<sup>25</sup> Brown and Johnston, p. 16.

systematic planning, and both speak of the frustration to both teachers and administrators by " . . . the limitations by these in change or technical perfection in goal statements and constant procedures."<sup>38</sup> Jenkins and Lohman agree that the complexity of the act of jumping is difficult in planning, and conclude, "Using vague terms will only confuse the staff and community. This confusion is likely to result in more difficulties, uncoordinated efforts and a confused public."<sup>39</sup>

Belmont is quoted as such figures in such decisions is identified as another drawback in systematic planning. This may result in a bias toward low risk proposals and little support of untested ideas according to Jenkins and Lohman.<sup>40</sup> The Commission on Instructional Technology by way of criticizing such cost-effectiveness approaches says, "Much data on the state of instructional technology lack the necessary scope and depth to help education managers make policy decisions: . . ."<sup>41</sup>

Yet another problem of systematic educational planning is reported to be its domination by financial considerations. In considering the concept of educational planning, Barclay and Lemery ask if education is to be valued as a resource paid in terms of the contribution to economic growth, for the new role, or both. They point out that the notion of

<sup>38</sup>Belmont, p. 44.

<sup>39</sup>Jenkins and Lohman, p. 4.

<sup>40</sup>Belmont, p. 40.

<sup>41</sup>Jenkins and Lohman, p. 4.

<sup>42</sup>By Leonard Lippinski, A Report to the President and the Committee of the Social Studies Commission, Office Commission on Instructional Technology, 1969, p. 126.

economists writing for educational policy-makers as a reflection of the influence of finance on planning. They write, "... the strongest impetus to planning has come from the desire to harness education to economic growth in recognition of which economists at the turn of the century...<sup>43</sup> Redefining educational planning in terms of economic and systems approaches, Juchacz says that the domain of school administrators, "... is being dominated by economic system designs, operations research procedures and critical path methodologies."<sup>44</sup> Smith also ties the financial pressure to the planning process in education in to, "... business critical of the educational costs and the public critical of the returns it is receiving on the educational dollar."<sup>45</sup> Smith also refers to this problem as the "Economic System" in education. Juchacz and Johnson point out that cost consciousness was brought by the budgeting aspect of systematic planning, view systematic planning as a means to limit expenditures and desired costs, and therefore favor finance planning in the finance department.<sup>46</sup>

Also, there is the reported problem of costs: this is a twofold problem dealing with the cost of systematic planning and the costs required to implement decisions resulting from the process. Reportedly few school districts have the funds required to add additional staff and resource people and provide training seminars. Because of this, it is predicted that many school systems will fail in their efforts to plan

<sup>43</sup>Juchacz and Johnson, p. 1.

<sup>44</sup>Juchacz, p. 18.

<sup>45</sup>Juchacz, p. 40.

<sup>46</sup>Juchacz and Johnson, p. 4.

systematically or will be forced to be satisfied with partial satisfaction alone.<sup>47</sup> Another related problem is that, "... within almost every the state to provide for them."<sup>48</sup> Greenfield suggests that there should be a realistic balance between educational goals and the ability or willingness to achieve them. He states,

... I feel it is better to emphasize explicitly that these two values--the educational and the monetary--underlie all policies developed for school systems and that such policy must be evaluated both in terms of the educational objectives which it serves and in terms of the costs involved.<sup>49</sup>

Finally, there is the legal problem: legal requirements for the relationship between planning and accounting may be at variance. According to Kemerich and Moore, legislatures have resisted in several states the installation of systems that combine planning, budgeting and allocation.<sup>50, 51</sup> This becomes a problem as, "... school programs are seldom conceived in the rigorous sense required in program budgeting."<sup>52</sup> Also, "Evaluation does not follow a rigorous program budgeting approach."<sup>53</sup> Florida's legislative mandate to report on its requirements. As indicated in Chapter 2, Florida school districts have been required to engage in

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>48</sup> Moore and Johnston, p. 36.

<sup>49</sup> Greenfield, p. 49.

<sup>50</sup> Kemerich, p. 146.

<sup>51</sup> Moore, p. 32.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

planning that is systematic, but the not required to use any particular planning model.<sup>14</sup>

In summary, the literature seems to indicate that persons engaged in systematic planning may encounter the following difficulties:

1. The concept of systematic planning is likely to be rejected at first-hand as strictly new.
2. Staff and community may reject systematic planning due to its novelty, its emphasis on accountability, and the confusion engendered 'hard-soft' techniques.
3. Identification and evaluation of educational outcomes as well as inputs are in a primitive state of development.
4. Systematic planning may contribute to centralization of decision-making thereby limiting democratic decision-making and the right to dissent.
5. Names terms will cause confusion, criticism, and disorganization.
6. Reliance on measures of the relation between costs and effectiveness may lead to a narrow and conservative approach to decision-making.
7. Systematic planning is costly.
8. Alternatives selected by the process of planning may not be tested.
9. Not any limited flexibility in the planning process.

#### Systematic Planning--Disadvantages

A search was also made of the literature to determine the advantages reported for systematic educational planning.

John reports that systematic educational planning responds to the felt needs of the community.<sup>15</sup> Needs assessment is an important

<sup>14</sup> David Hargrave, p. 214

<sup>15</sup> ibid., p. 22.

strength of systematic planning according to Rostow, who says that by identifying needs objectives, "... it furnishes the likelihood of having solutions that do not meet the actual needs."<sup>34</sup> The generation of alternatives is also generally reported as an advantage of the planning process. As Foster puts it, "The yield of the systems analysis is known as a set of feasible alternative alternatives under a degree of certainty."<sup>35</sup> Rostow also finds systematic planning to be concerned with investigating or inventing, "... alternative means of providing educational opportunities for a new strata, or even a declining population."<sup>36</sup> Rostow adds that systematic planning results at one stage in a set of feasible alternatives. This makes possible the, "... selection or specification of a preferred alternative for statement of objectives."<sup>37</sup>

Another advantage for systematic educational planning is reported to be its long-range perspective. For Foster this means that it prepares the educator for what is to come. He says, "It is a means of anticipating the difficulties in forecasting the future... In process

---

<sup>34</sup> Roger S. Gifford, Education and System Planning, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972, p. 3.

<sup>35</sup> G. W. Foster, System for Educational Planning: A Systematic Approach, Toronto: Macmillan MacKenzie, 1973, p. 26.

<sup>36</sup> Rostow, p. 21.

<sup>37</sup> Rostow, p. 20.

diffusivity and crisis and anticipates needs and problems.<sup>40</sup> Wright states, "Comprehensive planning, as the new science is called, includes permanent facilitation mechanisms in contrast to ad hoc/top-down planning."<sup>41</sup> This is valid in distinction to simulating the need for "crisis-flow" planning.<sup>42</sup> Jones also criticizes the ad hoc approach to planning and claims the advantage of multi-year planning to be the achievement of uniform production, achievement, and consistency.<sup>43</sup>

Both Ingram and Jones emphasize the advantage of the process of systematic planning in resolving decision-making.<sup>44,45</sup> According to Jones, "... a systems approach provides a better framework for decision-making. It provides this framework at the classroom level, the board level and the community level."<sup>46</sup> Jones claims the elements of choice provided by planning as a means of providing the decision-maker with "... an opportunity to assess the degree of achievement of educational objectives through systematic investigation, evaluation, and prediction of results."<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Wright & Jones, "Educational Planning," EMPHASIS, 1970, November, 1970, 37.

<sup>41</sup>Wright & Wright, "Comprehensive Planning: A Progress Report," National Association of Secondary Education, 1970, 31.

<sup>42</sup>Id.

<sup>43</sup>Id., p. 31.

<sup>44</sup>Ingram, p. 31.

<sup>45</sup>Id., p. 31.

<sup>46</sup>Id.

<sup>47</sup>Id., p. 31.

Creating a structure for cooperation is another advantage claimed for systematic planning. Ingram reports on such a cooperative planning climate created in Canada in which upper level agencies provided broad goals, responsibilities, and guidelines to lower level agencies in the school system. Support was also provided to the lower level agencies in terms of data and consulting services.<sup>68</sup> Wright also speaks favorably of systematic planning, " . . . characterized by broad involvement of those concerned with or affected by the products of planning, . . . ,"<sup>69</sup>

Hambrick writes of the systematic planning advantage of providing a vehicle for change. He explains that systematic planning, " . . . is a mechanism by which a system adapts its goals, priorities, and resources to changing environmental and internal forces."<sup>70</sup> Smith, describing as one of the popular systematic planning approaches says that, " . . . it is a system for the management of orderly change and allocation of resources."<sup>71</sup> Perhaps related to the advantage of responding to change, is the advantage of systematic planning of modifying the one process as well as the process of evaluation. Systematic educational planning is reported to have the capacity to reconstruct entire programs instead of just adding on limited programs.<sup>72</sup> To meet

---

<sup>68</sup>Ingram, p. 25.

<sup>69</sup>Wright, p. 24.

<sup>70</sup>Hambrick, p. 26.

<sup>71</sup>Smith, p. 12.

<sup>72</sup>Wright, p. 23.

to data and modify language activities,<sup>75</sup> and to change the pattern of education.<sup>76</sup>

Systematic planning is also required to aid in problem solving,<sup>77</sup> coping with uncertainty,<sup>78</sup> answering questions of accountability,<sup>79</sup> improving the learner,<sup>80</sup> and discovering the integrated<sup>81</sup> systematic planning has the potential, according to Kaufman, " . . . to identify and solve educational problems in the most rational and practical manner possible."<sup>82</sup> Ganssrich writes of the dynamic educational environment creating uncertainty and systematic planning providing the means by which the educational system copes with this uncertainty.<sup>83</sup> He further states that such systematic planning, " . . . can be such an part of an overall strategy for the implementation of an accountability system."<sup>84</sup> Davis agrees that systematic planning is, " . . . one aspect is necessary to meet the questions of accountability."<sup>85</sup> Kaufman speaks of the advantage of systematic planning becoming an the learner which will,

<sup>75</sup> Ganssrich, p. 37.

<sup>76</sup> Davis, p. 25.

<sup>77</sup> Kaufman, p. 24.

<sup>78</sup> Ganssrich, p. 30.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>80</sup> Kaufman, p. 25.

<sup>81</sup> Ganssrich, p. 24.

<sup>82</sup> Kaufman, p. 24.

<sup>83</sup> Ganssrich, p. 30.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>85</sup> Davis, p. 24.

"... ensure that each one's abilities, capabilities, fears, hopes, and aspirations are considered and satisfied."<sup>85</sup> Eisenhower gives Bay's discovery of the "marchers effect" as an example of systematic planning's "... tendency to encourage serendipity[;] the art of discovering the unexpected."<sup>86</sup>

Finally, efficiency is claimed as an advantage of systematic educational planning. Efficiency is usually defined in terms of time and resources. Baughart and Trull report that systematic planning saves time and, "... [w]hen possible relatively complex data analysis at an acceptable level of cost,"<sup>87</sup> and Birney goes on to say the method by which the best use is made of limited resources.<sup>88</sup>

The following advantages were emphasized in the literature about systematic planning:

1. Systematic planning produces better solutions that do not cost actual needs due to the inherent characteristics of needs assessment.
2. Systematic planning identifies desirable attitudes and self-awareness measures that aid the decision-maker in the selection of a preferred alternative for the attainment of objectives.
3. Long-range planning prepares the educator for what is to come thereby preventing crisis.
4. Systematic planning creates an atmosphere and structure for cooperative procedures.

<sup>85</sup>Woods, p. 12.

<sup>86</sup>Woods, p. 24.

<sup>87</sup>Baughart and Trull, p. 131.

<sup>88</sup>Wesley Birney, Planning and Managing Change (Saulster and Regis Press, 1975), p. viii.

5. Systematic planning provides for orderly change.
6. Systematic planning provides for orderly allocation of resources.
7. Systematic planning is self-correcting in terms of modifying the process of planning as well as the system.
8. Systematic planning aids in answering questions of accountability.
9. Systematic planning is a knowledge process.
10. Systematic planning is efficient.

### Implications for Effective Planning

The literature was also searched for supported elements of effective educational planning. Many of the writers who defined and identified systematic educational planning also supported, recommended or applied what constituted the elements of good or effective planning.

Educational planners are urged to become involved in the assessment of needs at the outset of the planning process. Hoffman recommends needs assessment as a way of providing, "... a thoroughly stated starting point for educational design."<sup>88</sup> Needs assessment should be diagnostic analysis which identifies the two polar positions of where we are now and where we need to be.<sup>89</sup> In their discussion of existing needs, drivers and blockers urge planners to take a specific look at goals and how they are being met.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>88</sup> Hoffman, p. 30.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

<sup>90</sup> Belove and Johnston, p. 35.

The writing of objectives in clear and measurable terms is another recommendation made in *Behavioral planning*.<sup>81</sup> Some writers of systematic planning that, " . . . represents an objective process requiring specification of what is done and why."<sup>82</sup> Rosowich claims that systematic planning procedures, " . . . demand specification of objectives written in terms that are unambiguous, behavior delineated, measurable, operational, challenging and realistic."<sup>83</sup> After participating in the training of sixty vocational educational teachers in the writing of behavioral objectives, Knight relates, "The use of behavioral objectives not only clearly delineates goals, but also establishes the basis for determining how effectively those goals have been reached."<sup>84</sup>

Suggestions are also made in relation to the gathering and use of information. Planning is a process accomplished by systematic gathering, organizing, and evaluating of data according to Kline.<sup>85</sup> He states that, "The systematic, methodologic aspects of program have as plans in planning."<sup>86</sup> Taylor recommends planning that is based on accurate and relevant information that includes " policies, rules and guidelines of the district; performance information on their programs;

<sup>81</sup> Kline, p. 18.

<sup>82</sup> Rosowich, p. 40.

<sup>83</sup> Knight, p. 32.

<sup>84</sup> Kline, p. 29.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

and information on their programs; human and financial resources; demographics, economic, and social statistics; access to data banks on alternative programs; and the wants and needs of clients.<sup>86</sup>

Systematic, minimal evaluation of alternatives is recommended for educational planning. Jones suggests that for any proposed change in a school system.<sup>87</sup> Smith says that the nature of the goals in systematic planning make it obvious that a system of evaluation is essential to successful planning.<sup>88</sup> Program evaluation is also recommended.<sup>89</sup> As Jenkins and Johnson relate, "It is obvious that we need to look at what happens to students in a given experience in order to judge the real worth of a program."<sup>90</sup> This type of program evaluation is further recommended as a way of holding the entire school system accountable.

A recommendation made by Jones and others is that the emphasis of educational planning be placed on outcomes rather than activities.<sup>91</sup> Ingram sees this emphasis on goals and outputs as one of the distinguishing characteristics of present day systematic educational planning.<sup>92</sup> And Wilson and Johnston say that the focus of planning, "... is on

<sup>86</sup>Ingram, p. 23

<sup>87</sup>Jones, p. 21.

<sup>88</sup>Smith, p. 44.

<sup>89</sup>Jenkins and Johnson, p. 25

<sup>90</sup>ibid.

<sup>91</sup>Jones, p. 21.

<sup>92</sup>Ingram, p. 24.

the consequences of our actions more than the intent of the activities of the individual themselves."<sup>103</sup>

McLuhan explains that educational planners need to take into account that, "... the domain of school administration is being dominated by economic system designs, operations research procedures, and critical path methodologies."<sup>104</sup> McLuhan recommends that educational planners recognize that each policy must be evaluated in terms of its educational objectives as well as its costs.<sup>105</sup> McLuhan also recommends that planners account for financial as well as educational considerations. He agrees with other writers that economists are more frequently consulted by educational planners than, biologists, psychologists, or statisticians, and attributes this to the current practice of relating education to economic growth.<sup>106</sup>

Feedback is recommended as a critical element in planning.<sup>107</sup> Feedback is defined as a process that enables the results of earlier decisions to be evaluated in order to make more effective future decisions, or information which provides a system to adjust future behavior according to past performance.<sup>108</sup> James Miller of thinking as the

<sup>103</sup> Miller and Johnson, p. 36.

<sup>104</sup> McLuhan, p. 22.

<sup>105</sup> McLuhan, p. 28.

<sup>106</sup> E. George Johnson, "Administrative Willingness and Dominant Preoccupation in the Educational System," The Planning Program: A System Perspective for School Design, p. 4.

<sup>107</sup> McLuhan, p. 7.

<sup>108</sup> ibid.

performance of the educational plan. In other, "Corrective measures, as a result of controlling, involve taking into account feedback from any system's communication network which constitutes an evaluation of what has occurred and re-planning to improve the operation and end product."<sup>109</sup>

According to Dwyer, planning should be given a place of prominence in the organizational structure.<sup>110</sup> To accomplish this, the person responsible for planning should be given a responsible position in the system or a person in a responsible position should be assigned the responsibility for planning.<sup>111, 112</sup>

In addition to the above recommendations concerning the planning process, suggestions are also made in relation to the persons involved in planning. The literature search indicates that educational planners should be provided with relevant data for planning,<sup>113</sup> should be involved cooperatively in the planning,<sup>114</sup> and should be trained for participation.<sup>115</sup> Jenkins and Lebow assumed relevant data for both administration and instructional staff.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup>Jones, p. 28.

<sup>110</sup>Dwyer, p. 34

<sup>111</sup>Ibid.

<sup>112</sup>Dwyer, p. 32.

<sup>113</sup>Jenkins and Lebow, p. 3.

<sup>114</sup>Jones, p. 28.

<sup>115</sup>Dwyer, p. 34.

<sup>116</sup>Jenkins and Lebow, p. 3.

Cooperation in planning is recommended by planners. "Good teamwork and cooperation will inevitably result in the... bottom up and top down setting of the RACD to reflect the best utilization of all resources, human and material."<sup>117</sup> "Involvement and participation of all levels of the organization is also recommended by Swell, who sees this as important in both the planning and implementing stages."<sup>118</sup> Kirley feels that it is a requirement of democracy that all levels be involved in planning.<sup>119</sup> Mayhew and his associates recommend cooperative procedures based on the examination of evidence from several RACDs of colonies.<sup>120</sup> In reporting on one study, Mayhew says,

The advantage of formulating a new co-operation group, such as a joint professional and lay committee to study school problems, is based on the hypothesis that the system forms a number of different social systems, each placed in the new team-to-team group, will cooperate with each other, form a new ad hoc social system and exchange information with each other without the necessity of allowing too many systems interaction.<sup>121</sup>

Mayhew recommends that cooperative procedures be planned for by the use of COMMITTEES in developing policies and programs and as a method of agreeing on goals and purposes. The following are recommended by Mayhew:

<sup>117</sup>Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>119</sup>Kirley, p. viii.

<sup>120</sup>Robert L. Mayhew, Don E. Johns, and Theodore L. Miller, *Educational Organization and Management* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 280.

<sup>121</sup>Ibid., p. 142.

Cooperative activities should be so planned as to be beneficial to the individuals and groups involved as well as to the schools.

School officials should give the most careful consideration to all proposals and recommendations growing out of a cooperative program, and should approve those which seem to be for the best interests of the school.

The major purpose of every individual and group should be to help improve education.

Cooperation should always be genuine and free time.

Smaller as practicable, decisions should be reached on the basis of consensus and agreement.

Leaders who understand and believe in cooperative procedures are essential.

Persons involved in cooperative projects should be broadly representative of all points of view in the school or community.

Both educators and lay citizens have responsibilities to meet and contribute to make in the development of the educational programs.

The development of a sound educational program requires the best cooperative efforts of both educators and lay citizens.<sup>122</sup>

Committee was in planning as also recommended by which the suggests it as an agreement on individual management decisions.<sup>123</sup>

Results of effective committee are are reported to be better programs, better policies, better decisions, and better ideas.<sup>124</sup>

<sup>122</sup> ibid., pp. 114-115.

<sup>123</sup> ibid., p. 44.

<sup>124</sup> A. B. Tucker and R. B. Tucker, Improving Human Resources (New York: Macmillan, Incorporated and William Morris and Company, Inc., 1964), p. 114.

Training for planning is also a frequent recommendation made to those who would engage in educational planning. Arora and Johnston imply that training of planners begins by defining or explaining the common faith that planning is technocratic, demands such technology, and uses such technical jargon.<sup>125</sup> They recommend the training of, " . . . senior staff--from superintendents to teachers--to become 'results' rather than 'activities' oriented."<sup>126</sup> Ingram recommends the employment of people with technical planning skills or the training of the present staff.<sup>127</sup> Wright reports on training in basic planning technology as a way of building planning skills and interest in system-wide planning,<sup>128</sup> and Freedman offers a planning model designed to train planners in needs assessment, programming, implementation, and evaluation.<sup>129</sup> Mathias and Hargis are concerned with creativity in planning and recommend that personnel be trained in creative techniques including brainstorming, windshield brainstorming, and hypothetical situation identification.<sup>130</sup>

The suggestions for planning from the review of the literature are presented below:

<sup>125</sup>Arora and Johnston, p. 36.

<sup>126</sup>Ibid.

<sup>127</sup>Ingram, p. 16.

<sup>128</sup>Wright, p. 15.

<sup>129</sup>Freedman, pp. 3-4.

<sup>130</sup>John Mathias and Thomas Hargis, The Search for Alternative Technologies: The Search Washington University Press, 1981, p. 10.

1. The statement of needs should figure early in the planning process.
2. Objectives should be written in objective and measurable terms.
3. Planning should be based on scientific data collection and analysis.
4. Planning should include the evaluation of alternatives.
5. Planning should include the evaluation of progress.
6. The process of planning should be self-correcting by means of feedback.
7. The emphasis of planning should be on outcomes.
8. Planning should be concerned with financial as well as educational considerations.
9. Planning should be given a place of prominence in the organizational structure.
10. Cooperation in planning is essential and must be an end in-itself.
11. All levels in the organization should participate in planning.
12. Consensus should be used in the planning process.
13. A training program should be provided to enhance planning skills.

### Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the literature covering educational planning has been reviewed. The purpose of this chapter was to present representative definitions of contemporary educational planning, to outline problems that may be expected by the educational planner, to indicate the advantages of good planning, and to specify suggestions for effective educational planning as indicated by the literature search.

Contemporary definitions of educational planning, are stated in terms that indicate that planning is an ongoing process which may occupy a variety of time spans, assume a variety of forms, and allocate various types of resources. Planning, as defined, is concerned with goals and objectives and with the selection of the most cost-effective way of achieving these goals and objectives. Contemporary educational planning is comprehensive, systematic, rational and places greater emphasis on strategy than did educational planning of an earlier time. Frederick indicates that this is the type of planning that the Florida Legislature and State Department of Education are speaking of when they refer to "comprehensive educational planning."

The possible confusion in educational planning over a combination of problems associated with systems approaches to planning and the reactions of educators to the technology and accountability strongly associated with systematic planning. For example, systematic planning in education has the drawback of being basically a new approach, even though many of its components are timeless. Because of this novelty, educational planning may be resisted by educators who perceive it as a mechanical and inflexible process. Systematic educational planning may also create measurement and evaluation problems as many of the inputs and outputs of education are unmeasurable, and because objectives and goals are often not stated in measurable, behavioral terms. Systematic planning, with its emphasis on data, may interfere with cooperative governance by centralizing decision-making and by using terminology that confuses and alienates lower-level planners. Further, systematic educational planning

may have the problem of being costly, may be dominated by financial considerations, and could at times conflict with legal requirements.

Systematic operational planning, however, has an impressive number of advantages. First, systematic, for example, has the reported potential of identifying both full costs and actual costs. Further, the long-term perspective of systematic planning is consistent with reducing short-sighted planning and providing the security for establishing long-range activities and broad-based development. The technology inherent in the systematic approach is said to be an aid to decision-making and a means of answering to the public call for accountability. Systematic planning according to the literature search also has the potential for dispersing change in an orderly, efficient and effective manner.

To realize the benefits of planning, objectives are urged by various writers to identify needs during the initial planning stages, and participants in the writing of clearly stated operational goals and objectives. Operational planners are also urged to make use of all available and relevant data in evaluating feasible alternatives, and in making resource allocation decisions. Planners are also directed to strike a balance between financial and operational considerations, be sensitive to feedback, include all levels in the organization in planning, make use of lay and professional consultants, provide training for planners, use sound-risk cooperative techniques, and assume the status of the planning process.

## CHAPTER III

### COMPARATIVE PLANNING IN THE SELECTED SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

#### Introduction

The manner in which two small school districts organized and administered comprehensive educational planning is the subject of this chapter. For the purpose of comparing, these selected districts are identified as School District A and School District B. A case study is provided for each of the districts. Subsequent to the case studies, the two school districts are subjected to a comparative analysis.

#### Planning in School District A

School District A is a small school district located in the north section of Florida. The nation school year completed is 1971<sup>1</sup> and the population has experienced no significant growth in the past ten years.<sup>2</sup> At the time of this writing, School District A has enrolled 700 students at one school which has a P-12 organization. The persons interviewed in School District A were: County Superintendent of Schools, General Supervisor of Schools, Finance Officer, and a guidance counselor.

---

<sup>1</sup>Interim Report No. 200, Population Characteristics of the Florida School Districts (Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education, 1974), p. 15.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

As indicated earlier, an interview guide was developed and used. A copy of the interview guide is shown in Appendix A.

### Initial Activity in Planning

The first three interview questions (1, 2, and 3) in the interview guide were asked to determine the initial activity of School District A that resulted from the legislative mandate to engage in comprehensive educational planning, and to determine who gave the ultimate responsibility for comprehensive planning. Data indicate that the superintendent, upon learning of this legislation, took the decision that county office staff, the school principal, teachers, and guidance counselors would have to get involved in the production of the comprehensive plan. Following this decision, the superintendent sent his finance officer, the school guidance counselors, and two classroom teachers to attend the regional comprehensive planning seminar that had been organized by the Florida State Department of Education. However, the ultimate responsibility for comprehensive planning was assigned to the General Supervisor of Schools.

### Rationale for Assignment of Responsibility for Planning

Two questions (4 and 5) were asked to determine the rationale for the assignment of the responsibility for comprehensive planning. Responses to these questions indicated that the General Supervisor of Schools had the time and the qualifications to coordinate such an activity. The interviewees explained that the general supervisor of schools was good at writing plans and called, " . . . (General) so only have four administrative positions in the county." Another respondent attributed the General

Department of Schools' close contact with the schools as sufficient reason for the assignment and the General Supervisor of Schools himself mentioned his school involvement. The plan attributed the assignment to a section of her job description that indicated that she was to: " . . . prepare all reports and maintain records on all Federal and State Projects."<sup>1</sup> The data indicate that in fact the assignment was made on the basis of this availability, time planning and writing skills, which as mentioned in the literature cited by Jenkins and Lottum, is consistent with effective planning practices.<sup>2</sup>

#### Extent of Participation in Planning

These questions II, 7, and 8 were asked to determine the extent of participation in comprehensive planning. Table 1 shows that there was agreement that county-level officials, individual schools, members of the community, teachers, students, employee organizations, and community organizations were involved in the planning. No other sector were said to be involved.

Respondents were asked in question 7 to explain the extent of involvement of the respective county-level officials. County officer-level involvement included the Superintendent of Schools, the General Supervisor of Schools and the Finance Officer. As previously mentioned, the Superintendent was reportedly involved by determining that the comprehensive planning would be participated in by county and school-level persons, by explaining the mandate, and by assigning the responsibility for planning to the General Supervisor of Schools. Additionally, the

<sup>1</sup>Jenkins and Lottum, p. 1.

Superintendent spoke to community organizations about the planning and asked that they participate by responding to a needs assessment survey. Beyond their legislative activities, the Superintendent participated only minimally in the planning by reading the rough draft of the plan and approving it. His most form of participation was in the act of recommending for approval the final draft to the Board of Education of School District 2.

TABLE 2  
 NEEDS ASSESSED TO PLANNING IN DISTRICT 2

| Interview Guide Question                                                                                                    | Response |     |    |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|----|-----|
|                                                                                                                             | Yes      | (%) | No | (%) |
| 1. Did the planning that led to the production of the district comprehensive educational plan represent the involvement of: |          |     |    |     |
| a. County-level Offices                                                                                                     | 4        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| b. Individual Schools                                                                                                       | 4        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| c. Members of the Community                                                                                                 | 4        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| d. Teachers                                                                                                                 | 4        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| e. Students                                                                                                                 | 4        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| f. Regional Organizations                                                                                                   | 4        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| g. Community Organizations                                                                                                  | 4        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| h. Other                                                                                                                    | 0        | 0   | 4  | 100 |

The several supervisors of schools participated in planning by working with both the school and the county-level officers. Her main

function was to see that the planning and budgeting aspects of the comprehensive planning "matched." Therefore, she attended most of the school planning meetings and worked closely with the Finance Officer. Her office also prepared the classified version of the comprehensive plan that was presented to the board.

The Finance Officer participated by working closely with the school administrators and the General Supervisor of Schools to insure that the budget related to the comprehensive plan. The Finance Officer was said to be the person in School District 8 who classified how budgeting and planning related.

Responses to the eighth question indicated that members of the community, students, and community organizations were involved in the comprehensive planning process only by reacting to needs assessment surveys. The data indicated that the employee organizations (the local education association) was not actually involved as an organization. In question 8, when respondents were asked if employee organizations were involved in the planning, they, as indicated in Table 1, consistently answered no. However, subsequent interview data showed that this was a misperception. As discussed in the following pages, teachers were involved in the planning but they were involved as teachers, and not as representatives of the employee organization.

The individual school was involved in the planning in several ways. As previously mentioned, the business associations and two selected education teachers attended regional comprehensive planning seminars. As a result of this, they participated with the General Supervisor of Schools in organizing a school-level group for the purpose of constructing

Other forms of needs assessment (self-assessment) were to be administered in schools, but in relation to the needs of the community. All of these needs assessment procedures aimed at illuminating opinions of both needs. The school and teacher needs assessment forms were administered by the school-level committee and the community forms were administered by the Council Representative of Schools.

In addition to working in the needs assessment instrument, all teachers participated in the writing of: (i) Needs, (ii) Objectives, (iii) Strategies, and (iv) Evaluation (as an institutional unit). 5-6 teachers participated in writing grade-level plans whereas 3-12 plans were organized by institutional departments.

The principal participated in the planning by examining the results of all the returned forms of the needs assessment surveys and then writing school-wide: (i) Needs, (ii) Objectives, (iii) Strategies, and (iv) Evaluation which were forwarded to the Council Representative of Schools.

It was interesting to note that all of this planning activity resulted in only one reported change. This change was the manner in which institutional supply allocations were distributed. Each of the thirty-eight teachers in School District A were given individual institutional supply budgets and were allowed to participate in negotiating their budgets. According to Harting, this practice would constitute an effective planning characteristic and be a successful participatory budget planning by all personnel involved in the educational program. Harting suggested that, "budgets in many institutions are prepared by the hand of

a department, with an initial consultation of other members of the department, then go through the normal chain of command for review and approval.<sup>4</sup>

### Comprehensive Planning Committee

Several interview questions were asked to determine the organization and use of committees in comprehensive planning. Interviewees reported that no committee was formed for engaging in comprehensive planning. In institutional analysis, a school committee was formed to create and administer a needs assessment survey, but on this was the only function. It was merely formed in a specialized manner than in a comprehensive manner. When asked, "What committee was formed for the purpose of engaging in comprehensive educational planning?" one elementary school teacher answered, "I'm not sure." Another said, "a committee to write up the needs assessment form." She then indicated that no committee was formed to recruit teachers to participate in the variety of related planning activities that resulted in the comprehensive planning document (see definition of comprehensive planning committee, Chapter II).

### Quality of Planning Practices

A series of ten interview statements were made to determine if the planning resulting in the production of the comprehensive planning document could be described as "effective" or "ineffective."

Table 3 shows that all respondents either partially or completely agreed that the planning process provided greater flexibility to those who

---

<sup>4</sup>Henry J. Hartley, Organizational Planning-Theory-Research-Application & Systems Approach, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1949, p. 11.

specific educational processes but at the same time said that were amenable for revision; according to the philosophy of the Florida State Department of Education as reflected in Chapter 3, "the combination of flexibility and accountability would be indicative of good planning practice."

General agreement is seen in the responses to Interview question 1F, "Extended time was provided for staff members." These respondents said that this was an exact description of what occurred and one said that it was partially descriptive. They further agree that teachers and administrators must be released from their regular duties of planning in order to flourish. Research instruments that teachers and staff have access to assist in producing certain duties so that there will be time for " . . . staff and coordinating teachers to plan with colleagues, consult students, diagnose learning problems of individuals, and carry out a variety of other important professional tasks aimed at improving teaching and learning."<sup>3</sup>

Response to Interview statement 2F indicated that the use of jumps was not a problem in the planning. According to the literature review, this would be a characteristic of effective planning. As previously indicated, Jenkins and Lohme were against the use of jumps based in the planning process, and predict that staff and community involvement may result.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup>George W. Bennett, "Standardizing the Year," *The Elementary and Secondary Era*, Kenneth W. Locke, ed., (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981), p. 42.

<sup>4</sup>Jenkins and Lohme, p. 2.

STATEMENTS OF PLANNING PRACTICES IN COUNTY A

| Interviewee's Self-Description                                                                                                                                       | Interviewee's Self-Description of Planning |     |                       |    |                      |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|----|----------------------|-----|
|                                                                                                                                                                      | no actual description                      |     | a partial description |    | with a description   |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                      | Responses<br>Percent                       |     | Responses<br>Percent  |    | Responses<br>Percent |     |
| 14. The planning process provided present financing to those who operate educational programs but it has more time made than more attention to the results.          | 3                                          | 33  | 3                     | 33 | 4                    | 0   |
| 15. Detailed time was provided for staff members.                                                                                                                    | 3                                          | 75  | 1                     | 25 | 0                    | 0   |
| 16. Much technical jargon was used in the planning process.                                                                                                          | 0                                          | 0   | 4                     | 33 | 3                    | 75  |
| 17. The planning process assumed that one person or group of persons was more expert in the planning process than others.                                            | 3                                          | 33  | 3                     | 33 | 3                    | 33  |
| 18. The involvement and serious interaction of a large number of people required financial.                                                                          | 0                                          | 0   | 0                     | 0  | 0                    | 100 |
| 19. Previous work was in the planning process so that the results of earlier decisions would be reflected in order to make more effective future decisions.          | 3                                          | 75  | 1                     | 25 | 0                    | 0   |
| 20. Governmental systems in the educational system were involved in policy making at the local level in those systems that would affect their policies and programs. | 3                                          | 33  | 3                     | 33 | 0                    | 0   |
| 21. Participants in the planning felt that some planners could not be displaced.                                                                                     | 0                                          | 0   | 0                     | 0  | 4                    | 100 |
| 22. Participants in the planning displayed a feeling of social equality.                                                                                             | 0                                          | 33  | 3                     | 33 | 0                    | 0   |
| 23. Cooperation in the planning was provided and from staff.                                                                                                         | 0                                          | 100 | 0                     | 0  | 0                    | 0   |

As general comments are indicated, the responses to interview statement 18, "The planning committee selected that not persons or groups of persons were more involved in the planning process than others," are independent facts that they are exactly the same, neither are the interview statement is partially true, and two other interviewees completely disagreed.

As the reader is aware, Edward Bickelstien did not involve a large number of people in the planning process. Accordingly, respondents unanimously disagreed with interview statement 19 which reads, "The involvement and interest participation of a large number of people in planning created disaster."

Dr Edward Bickelstien is, nevertheless, in part of the responses to interview statement 21, provision was made in the planning process so that the results of earlier decisions could be collected in order to make more effective future decisions. These persons are that is exactly the same and are agreed that it was partially true. Rosenfield completely and positively original to effective planning.<sup>7</sup>

Responses were evenly divided between the "exact" and "partial" category to the statement that, "lower-level agencies in the educational system were involved in policy making at the upper level in those matters that would affect their policies and programs." As reported in the review of the literature, Japan would approve planning which involved a variety of levels in policy-making.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup>Rosenfield, p. 7.

<sup>8</sup>Japan, p. 16.

Another source -- responding to the twenty-third statement, "Participation in the planning process felt that some planners could not be disputed." According to these interviewees, this statement was not descriptive of School District 4's planning. One respondent explained, "We have a close relationship [with the Superintendent] and no fear of expression systems. It is probably different in a large county where people strictly work the superintendent." This respondent seemed to be describing not a democratic atmosphere that would be considered effective by Hirsch and Tippelt, and defined by them as "friendly" atmosphere and characteristics of the democratic group.<sup>9</sup>

According to responses to interview question 14, participation in the planning process displayed a feeling of social equality. Half the respondents saw this as exactly the case and the other half agreed that it was partially so. As indicated in the interviewee matrix, Hargret, Jones, and Keller view a democratic atmosphere in planning as neutral to productivity.<sup>10</sup>

The third interview statement in this section, "Cooperation in the planning was genuine and from the heart," received a unanimous positive response. According to Hargret and Jones, this would be indication of effective planning practice; while analyzing factors necessary for success in planning by citizen participation, Hargret concluded that,

<sup>9</sup> Ralph White and Harold Tippelt, "Leaders Behaviors and Action Reaction in Three 'Social Climates,'" *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*, Marvin Dattwight and Alvin Barker, eds., Vol. 11, (New York: Wiley & Son, Publishers, 1981), p. 221.

<sup>10</sup> Hargret, Jones, and Keller, *Planning and Administration and Implementation*, p. 121.

Responses to planning should describe general processes.<sup>11</sup>

#### State Role in Comprehensive Planning

Four questions (34, 37, 38, and 39) were asked to determine the usefulness of the Florida State Department of Education's publication, Guidelines, the usefulness of the regional comprehensive educational seminar scheduled by the Florida State Department of Education, and the usefulness of the visits to School District A by Florida State Department of Education officials concerned with comprehensive planning. However, the purpose of this series of questions was to determine what role School District A would prefer that the Florida State Department of Education play in comprehensive educational planning.

The data indicate that planners in School District A had initial difficulties in the interpretation of Guidelines, but overcame that initial confusion and used the information from Guidelines as a framework that guided their planning. Guidelines was reportedly used as an integral part of a day-long, workshop meeting with all teachers. Respondents also indicated that Guidelines was helpful by providing a description of state expectations for comprehensive planning to the planners in School District A.

Regional comprehensive planning seminars were not generally described as very helpful to comprehensive planning. As one respondent explained, "When we returned from the seminars we always found things that had not been covered." Visits to School District A by Florida State

<sup>11</sup> Guidelines, p. 101.

Department of Education officials were described in vague or negative terms. One extreme response was, "They say we will have stayed home." One respondent went even farther that the suggestions of the Department of Education's officials were relevant for the following year's planning, but not useful to aid in the comprehensive plan then in preparation.

All respondents agreed that the Florida State Department of Education should take a more active role in comprehensive planning. Definitions of "active" varied and included stepping-in assistance in terms of consultative services, evaluation of the potential of comprehensive planning to achieve goals and expectations, and closer supervision of school district implementation of the plan. As one respondent put it, "They ought to remove the guidelines." Another said, "I would like for them to take a real good look at all of this mandated planning." The earliest response was, "if we have to have a plan, someone needs to see that the school district goes by it." These responses indicate a general dissatisfaction with state participation in planning. Opinions varied from challenging the relevancy of such planning to plans for more highly structured planning guidelines and closer state supervision.

One respondent concluded the interview by saying,

I think that you should have that our primary concern is with meeting the needs of all our system rather than following their guidelines or writing what they want to hear. In the end, we wrote a plan that was applicable to us. We feel that if we can meet state educational standards that is about as good a program as we can put

#### Planning in School District 8

School District 8 is like a small school district and like School District 4 is located in the north portion of Florida. The median

school year consisted of 184,<sup>12</sup> and the population has experienced a 21.8 percent growth in the last 10 years.<sup>13</sup> At the time of this writing, School District # had some 1,700 students who attended two schools. Each of the two small towns in School District # has a school. One of these two schools is divided into a K-4 school with a building principal and a 7-12 school with a supervising principal and an assistant principal. The other school in the district is run as a 5-12 school administered by a principal and an assistant principal. The persons interviewed in District # were the County Superintendent of Schools, and the General Supervisor of Schools.

In finished manner, an interview guide was developed and used. A copy of the interview guide appears in Appendix A.

#### Initial Interview in Planning

Upon learning of the legislative mandate to engage in comprehensive educational planning, the Superintendent of School District # assigned the responsibility for comprehensive planning to the General Supervisor of Schools who was also the Director of Instruction. As explained to the writer, "In this county we tend very late," such respondents agreed that this assignment of responsibility for comprehensive planning was the initial administrative activity and occurred in 1988.

<sup>12</sup>Research Report by U.S. Population Characteristics of the Florida School Districts, p. 14.

<sup>13</sup>Id., p. 14.

### Selection for Assignment of Responsibility for Planning

The first indication that the assignment was made was the General Supervisor of Schools as he was the person in the county who was most involved in the area of instruction, and who had the greatest personal contact with other instructional personnel.

### Extent of Participation in Planning

Respondents were in agreement that county-level officials, individual schools, members of the community, teachers, and students were involved in comprehensive planning, and that the employee organization and community organizations were not.

The Superintendent and the General Supervisor of Schools worked very closely in determining what data were necessary for the production of the comprehensive plan, and in designing the structure in which planning would take place. According to respondents, the General Supervisor of Schools called the school principals in for a county-level meeting for the purpose of acquainting them with planning, and for the purpose of discussing the comprehensive format with them. The Superintendent was also present at this meeting, and participated with the General Supervisor of Schools in interpreting planning, and in making proposals for the organization of comprehensive planning in School District 8. The interview data indicate that the comprehensive planning that followed involved, in varying degrees, all administrative personnel, all instructional personnel, all auxiliary services personnel, and, to a lesser extent, students and members of the community.

The decision was reached at the date mentioned meeting that the comprehensive planning would occur in the context of four comprehensive planning committees. These committees became the Administrative Comprehensive Planning Committee, the Secondary Instructional Comprehensive Planning Committee, the Elementary Instructional Comprehensive Planning Committee, and the Citizens Comprehensive Planning Committee.

The Administrative Comprehensive Planning Committee was composed of five members--the superintendent, the General Supervisor of Schools, and the three principals. This committee supplied various planning data such as demographic information and student achievement information to the other three committees. Information received from the Elementary and Secondary Comprehensive Planning Committees was similarly reported by the General Supervisor of Schools into the district comprehensive planning document.

Both the Elementary and Secondary Comprehensive Planning Committees functioned in the same manner. Comprehensive planning for these committees consisted of the production of instructional plans and syllabi for the elementary and secondary curriculum. The format was identical for elementary and secondary. The format required that each instructional unit be reported in terms of: (1) Goals, (2) Activities, (3) Objectives, (4) Evaluation, and (5) Budget. In the secondary grades, certain area teachers conducted field efforts to produce the required instructional area comprehensive plan. Participation ranged from one to seven per instructional area because of variations in instructional offerings. In the case of Spanish, for example, one teacher produced the entire plan whereas the comprehensive plan for language arts

was the result of the efforts of school teachers. Elementary curriculum sheets and comprehensive plans were produced in the same manner but, due to the self-initiated nature of the elementary curriculum in school district 1, several elementary teachers participated in the making of each instructional comprehensive plan. The plans of both elementary and secondary levels were turned into the principals who approved them as a school level, and delivered them to the General Supervisor of Schools who then incorporated them into the district comprehensive planning document.

The District Comprehensive Planning Committee had for its membership the General Supervisor of Schools, the three principals, the county health officer, the county juvenile counselor and a number of parents. The only reported function of this committee was in the act of reviewing and acting on recommendations concerning the results of the planning of the Elementary and Secondary Comprehensive Planning Committee. Even though the General Supervisor of Schools was a member of this committee, the recommendations of the administrative committee were made to the three principals.

#### Comprehensive Planning Committee

In interviews related to literature questions 1, 2, and 4 by explaining the organization and functions of the comprehensive planning committee, the writer did not ask interviewee question 3 through 11. The data indicated that both teachers and citizens' committees influenced policy primarily at the individual school level. Although many writers would urge a more direct approach to citizens and teacher involvement in

differentiated policy making. The reader is reminded that School District 8 is among the few smallest in a state that has sixty-seven school districts, which suggests that in small school districts with relatively homogeneous populations and "harmony of interests" there is less necessity for willows to go beyond the school in their community to exert influence.<sup>14</sup>

### Summary of Planning Functions

Respondents agreed that interview statement 14, "The planning provided greater flexibility to those who operate educational programs, but at the same time made them more accountable for results," was partially true. One respondent further qualified the statement by saying, "Flexibility more accountability than flexibility."<sup>15</sup>

Respondents also agreed that released time had been provided for staff members to engage in comprehensive planning. Such provision for released time for planning is recommended by many willows who also make provision or identification of effective planning practices.<sup>16</sup> 40

According to respondents in School District 8, individual groups was not used in the planning process. To further emphasize this fact, the writer was read a section of School District 8's planning document, the interviewee read,

14 producing this plan we are using of a finished product which can be used by a person who is not

---

<sup>14</sup>See Mann and Gerald F. Morgan, Education and Social Change in Modern America, New York: World McKay Company, Inc., 1971, p. 34

<sup>15</sup>Mann and Johnston, p. 34

<sup>16</sup>Mann, p. 38

Similar with school work and school, even now they will be able after reading it to be knowledgeable about the system

Communicating effectively by the use of terminology understandable to all persons is a popular technological rule in educational planning. Hartley offers several rules for improving communication in planning, the first of which is, "Use simple words to express clarity and understanding."<sup>47</sup> Data indicate that School District 8 followed that rule.

The planning process reportedly revealed that one person or group of persons was more expert in the planning process than others. One comment was, "You will always find different levels of comprehension of planning." As indicated in the literature search, differences in planning expertise has the potential to cause conflict,<sup>48</sup> however, no such situation was reported by respondents.

A large number of persons did not participate in the planning and no tension was created among those who did participate according to respondents. The writer was confused at this stage of the interview that only seventy-five teachers, plus a "handful of administrators and lay persons were actually involved in the process.

The twenty-fourth interview statement, "Particular was made at the planning process to make the results of earlier decisions could be revisited in order to make more effective future decisions," was described by respondents as partially descriptive. One respondent explained that there was, "... constant review by the study group all the way

<sup>47</sup>Hartley, p. 265

<sup>48</sup>Craft, p. 72

through," such "centralized" systems would be compatible with effective planning according to Hartley. Hartley writes, "All programs, existing and new programs, should be continuously reviewed and revised on both a formal and informal basis."<sup>10</sup>

Interviewees reported that the interviewee statement, "lower-level systems in the educational system were involved in policy making at the upper level in those matters that would affect their policies and programs," was only partially descriptive. Respondents explained that most policies in Federal District 1 in fact came from the schools rather than from the "upper levels." Brown implies that such decentralized decision-making is a characteristic of effective planning.<sup>11</sup>

Respondents explained that the representative planning Council was currently agreed upon and mutually affected in and that members of the various committees felt free to challenge the opinions of other committee members. Such a democratic relationship in planning is recommended by many writers. Watts and Higgett list many advantages of democratic relationships involving feelings on the part of individuals of lower departments and more individuality resulting in "spontaneous work interests."<sup>12</sup>

Further confirmation that the planning atmosphere was democratic was given in response to the last two interview statements in that series. The planners reportedly displayed mutual equality and cooperation among themselves and in good faith.

<sup>10</sup>Hartley, p. 234.

<sup>11</sup>Brown, p. 26.

<sup>12</sup>Watts and Higgett, p. 129.

### State Role in Comprehensive Planning

#### Guidelines for District Commissioners' Operational Planning

The report furnished by the Florida State Department of Education to help districts with comprehensive planning, reportedly assisted planners in School District F develop their own guidelines and thereby produce the comprehensive plan.

Regional comprehensive planning sessions conducted by the Florida State Department of Education were described favorably by respondents. One respondent indicated that the main value of the regional sessions was in the provision of an explanation of the legislative intent. Another claimed that the sessions kept the planners in School District F, "... on an even keel." The data indicate that planners in School District F were generally satisfied with these regional sessions and gained valuable assistance from them.

Views by Florida State Department of Education officials concerned with comprehensive planning were also described in positive terms. According to respondents, these visits provided School District F planners with suggestions for the actual mechanical aspects of the planning document such as ordering and the division of sections in the plan. Further assistance was said to be the monitoring activity of the visits. "They would come to see if we were making sound progress." Although one interviewee said, "They didn't change anything in our plan," this indicates that these visits were helpful in monitoring the progress of the planning, and in consulting with the supervisor of the planning document.

interviewed, commented that the role played by the Florida State Department of Education would assume the same which they perceived as consultative, supportive, and supervisory.

#### Comparative Analysis of Comprehensive Planning in the School Districts

The demographic information presented at the beginning of these two case studies shows that the two school districts under examination in this chapter are similar in geographic location, population, within school year enrollment, school organization, and county office-level educational administrative organization. Both school districts received notice of the mandate to engage in comprehensive planning at approximately the same time and both received the same type of planning literature from the Florida State Department of Education. However, the resulting organization and administration of comprehensive planning, the extent of use of effective planning practices, and the receipt of state-level assistance was both similar and dissimilar.

The superintendents of these two small school districts assigned the responsibility for comprehensive planning to an assistant superintendent, who, in both cases, carried the title of the General Supervisor of Schools. The assignment of the responsibility for coordinating the planning was made in both school districts on the basis of the instructional emphasis of the office and the previous experience of the person holding the office in preparing state reports. Subsequent to the assignment of the responsibility for comprehensive planning, the Superintendent of School District 2 participated visibly only by endorsing the administration and financing of the school to the comprehensive planning concept. The Superintendent

did not participate beyond this except to read and approve the written plan and to recommend the finished product to the school board for approval. The superintendent of School DISTRICT 8 in like manner implemented comprehensive planning at the school level but he did this only as the school-district level in the meeting of the Administrative Comprehensive Planning Committee which was composed of three principals, the General Supervisor of Schools and the Superintendent. The superintendent of School DISTRICT 8, however, did not abandon the planning activity in this grade, but continued to work closely with the General Supervisor of Schools and with the Administrative Comprehensive Planning Committee in determining the planning format, and in collecting and organizing instructional area information and other necessary information into the final comprehensive planning document.

The manner in which the administration of the two small subject districts involved the curriculum and materials in planning was comparable. The administration of School DISTRICT 8 decided that the emphasis of comprehensive planning would be on needs assessment followed by curricular planning. Two guidance counselors and two teachers agreed to construct needs assessment forms which were basically questionnaires or opinionnaires to be administered by students, faculty, and members of the community. Members of the community and students did not actually participate in planning beyond reacting to these needs assessment surveys. Teachers participated in the planning by attending a day-long comprehensive planning workshop at which they were required to read Excellence, and fill out the needs assessment forms. At the close of this training session, teachers agreed to participate in comprehensive planning by

preparing curriculum plans at each level in the elementary grades by instructional areas in the secondary grades. These plans were to reflect needs, objectives, strategies for meeting those needs, and methods of evaluating programs.

Administration in School District 8 decided at one of the initial meetings of the Administrative Comprehensive Planning Committee, to involve the community and districts by first meeting those conditions. The proposal was presented by the General Supervisor of Schools and accepted by the faculties and parents that all elementary teachers would be members of an Elementary Comprehensive Planning Committee, all secondary teachers would comprise a Secondary Comprehensive Planning Committee, and parents with the assistance of school administrators would constitute the Citizens Comprehensive Planning Committee. No action was taken at School District 8, but both elementary and secondary teachers were asked to produce instructional area plans that listed needs and identified in outline the discrepancy between what was needed and what was anticipated to implement the plans that they produced. The Citizens Comprehensive Planning Committee participated by reviewing these plans and making recommendations to the individual school principals.

Although four comprehensive planning committees were named in School District 8 and none in School District 4, the comprehensive planning process in both school districts basically was comprised of the production of curriculum plans in the school level which were modified and incorporated into the district comprehensive planning document by county office administration.

The basic difference in the planning of the two districts was not in the presence or absence or activity of groups who carried the title of "Comprehensive Planning Committee." The difference was that School District A approached comprehensive planning by attempting to assess present needs which they could use to form the basis of curriculum planning. Whereas School District B teachers were only asked to list what they considered to be instructional needs for their specific instructional areas. Further, the format in which teachers in School District A were required to present the curriculum plans included the listing of goals, objectives, and evaluation as did the format of School District B but, did not require any budgetary information.

The data indicate that the comprehensive planning documents evolved that School District A participated in comprehensive planning which emphasized formal needs assessment, instructional area planning, and emphasized the relationship between budgeting and planning." School District B, in comprehensive planning, placed emphasis on instructional planning and budgetary requirements necessary for implementing the planned programs and de-emphasized formal needs assessment activities. School District A's planning documents had very few references to needs of individual programs. It did reference, for example, the work of the entire instructional program and the entire administrative units, but made reference to other units separate of specific course needs or administrative units were sought. The planning documents produced by School District B on the other hand displayed needs and descriptions between various classrooms and actual allotments for every instructional area.

All administrators, all teachers, all students and some

parents of the community were involved in comprehensive planning on both school districts in varying degrees. In school district A, members of the community were involved on a routine basis by the act of filling out needs assessment instruments. Teachers of the community in school district B did not respond to a needs assessment survey, but served as a Citizens Comprehensive Planning Committee and participated by attending comprehensive planning meetings with principals and school district administrators, by reviewing the instructional plans of teachers and by making recommendations to the school principals.

Teachers in school district A participated in the planning by reacting to the needs assessment survey for teachers, by administering the needs assessment instrument for students, and by producing either grade-level or interdisciplinary-level plans. They were involved primarily in planning for their own particular grade level or instructional area and not broadly as in an interdisciplinary way. School district A's teachers were heavily involved in planning. In addition to preparing instructional area plans, they met as an interdisciplinary group throughout the year in committees.

School district middle-level administrators described in basically the same way in both school districts by reviewing the school plans and using them to construct the district plan. Students in both districts played a passive role in planning. School district A considered the results of the needs assessment instruments and student standardized test scores in planning whereas school district B used only student standardized test scores.

Responses by the respondents on the two school districts to selected statements from the literature of effective or ineffective planning practice indicated that both School District A and School District B were, in varying degrees, engaging in planning practices characteristic of effective planning. Planners in both districts generally agreed that comprehensive planning provided more flexibility and accountability although some were hesitant to comprehensively agree. One of the respondents in School District A indicated that the balance favored accountability rather than flexibility. Both school districts reportedly provided released time for planning and neither made use of existing educational technology. The data indicate that there was a variation in planning expertise in both school districts, but neither reported that it was detrimental to the planning process. Both school districts indicated that prevention was made for feedback in the planning process but the data indicate that in both districts feedback was incorporated in a very informal manner by way of discussion or one-on-one rather than in the form of written reports or written recommendations. Both school districts reportedly involved school-level personnel in policy making. Also, planners in both school districts displayed a feeling of racial equality and cooperation in planning was accepted as practice and in good faith.

Comparison of the two school districts' perceptions of the Florida State Department of Education's relationship to comprehensive planning revealed wide differences. Both school districts used collaboration as the basis for their planning activities, although School District A reported some initial difficulty in its interpretation.

School District A reportedly benefited little from the regional comprehensive planning sessions provided by the state, whereas planners in School District B felt that the sessions were educational, and had a stabilizing effect on their comprehensive planning. That difference in the perception of the regional sessions is interesting as both school districts are located in the same region, and, by this fact, attended the same sessions.

Representative in School District A also experienced dissatisfaction with the visits that were made to their school district by Florida State Department of Education officials. Representations made by these officials were not perceived as relevant to the fourth year's planning activities. In contrast, planners in School District B felt that the visits were useful. Visits helped with the organization of the planning and the organization of the planning document according to those instructions. Planners in School District B felt that the role of the Florida State Department of Education should change sharply from responsibility in School District B thought that the state role should remain the same. Representatives in School District B concluded that the state should create guidelines, maintain the concept of unified planning, and more closely supervise the implementation of comprehensive plans in districts.

#### Chapter Summary and Conclusions

The data about comprehensive planning in School District A and School District B were discussed in this chapter. The activities comprising the organization and administration of comprehensive planning in these two small school districts were very similar. Although the Representatives in School District A participated little beyond the initial

presentation of planning information and the Superintendent of school district B participated, at least on a county office level, throughout the planning. The school level effort was similarly the same. At district B, both school districts participated primarily by producing curriculum plans in uniform formats. The School District A, the format began with the listing of needs and ended with the listing of constructive activities. School District B also began the format with needs but ended with helpful information stressing the discrepancy between what they needed and what allocated.

Both school districts, when requested to submit statements from the planning literature, were seen to be engaging in primarily effective planning practices. However, School District B's naming and use of several comprehensive planning committees appeared to more actively and effectively involve teachers and personnel in comprehensive planning than the more administrative procedure of School District A. Both school districts possibly could improve the planning process by using planning committees.

Even though the actual comprehensive planning was similar in the two districts, their perceptions of the state department activity were quite different. At both school districts were observed to be making steps toward engaging in comprehensive planning in the representative more national in philosophy, perhaps the suggestion of School District A that the state play a stronger role in comprehensive planning would be relevant for both school districts.

## CHAPTER IV

### COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN THE SEVEN (II) HIGH-RISE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

#### Introduction

The manner in which the two selected reformed school districts organized and administered comprehensive educational planning is the subject of this chapter. After the case-study examination, they will be compared in terms of the process and products of the comprehensive planning. For the purpose of consistency, these school districts are identified as School District C and School District D.

#### Planning as School District C

School District C is a reform-based school district located in the south section of Florida. The population is composed of 86.4 percent white, 9 percent black, and an insignificant percent of other.<sup>1</sup> The median school year completed is 12.2.<sup>2</sup> District C is reported to be one of the fastest growing school districts in the state as the population has increased 44.1 percent in the past ten years.<sup>3</sup> At the time of this writing, District C has enrolled some 18,000 students at 14 schools. The persons interviewed in District C were: County Superintendent of

---

<sup>1</sup>General Report No. 306, Population Characteristics of Florida Schools, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup>Id., p. 46.

<sup>3</sup>Id., p. 15.

Schools, Coordinator of Instructional Programs, Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance, Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Personnel, Supervisor of Elementary Education, Director of Transportation, Director of School Food Services, Director of Vocational Education, Assistant Superintendent for Operations, and an elementary school principal.

An interview outline, or interview guide was developed and used. A copy of the interview guide is shown in Appendix A.

### Initial Activity in Planning

One aspect of this study involved a description of initial activity taken in School District C to accomplish comprehensive planning. Upon learning of this legislation, the Superintendent assigned the responsibility for comprehensive educational planning to the Coordinator of Instructional Programs. Following this decision, a staff meeting was called at which all district-level divisions heads met to discuss year plans were presented. At this meeting, the concept of comprehensive educational planning was outlined and the Superintendent made it clear that all divisions and schools were expected to cooperate with the Coordinator of Instructional Programs in the planning leading to the production of the document. In the interview, the Superintendent explicitly stated that the Director of Instructional Programs was given the ultimate responsibility to organize the planning and to produce the document.

There was some variation in opinion about its direct impact upon what took in the planning process. Some respondents thought that the planning meeting was most significant, whereas others said that the

appointment of a staff member to head up the planning for the first significant action. Actually, these actions included in close proximity and even both significant actions.

### Indicators for Assignment of Responsibility for Planning

Data indicate that several factors led to the assignment of the responsibility for comprehensive planning. Interviewees stated that if persons with purely administrative responsibilities had been given the assignment, the actions would not adequately reflect the instructional process. These interviewees also felt that the assignment should be given to a person who had experience in the planning process, first-hand contact with the students, a close knowledge of the instructional program, and the time to do so. The Coordinator of Instructional Programs was considered to be the logical choice to fill this combination of needs. Also, according to most responses, the Coordinator of Instructional Programs was further considered to be the logical choice because his division carried with it the connotation of instruction rather than administration, he had written other formal plans previous to the mandate to produce a detailed comprehensive educational plan, and he was willing to take on this enhanced responsibility. This type of initiative for participation in planning is consistent with Jenkins' and Lohman's suggestion for effective planning processes. They write that if time for planning is not available, "... the results will be poorly needed, written, and inadequate."<sup>8</sup> These writers also feel that the success of planning will depend on the skills, both technical and managerial, of the

---

<sup>8</sup>Jenkins and Lohman, p. 8

persons responsible for it. An interview respondent explained, "The design itself was based on the ability of the head of the district." Another said, "We had the idea, since then that appears clear."

#### Extent of Participation in Planning

As seen in Table 3, there was general agreement that county-level officials, individual schools, and teachers were involved in the planning. Respondents, however, did not display this same conviction that the members of the community were involved in the planning. Besides, employer organizations, community organizations, and other ideas were not perceived by the majority of respondents to be involved in comprehensive planning.

TABLE 3  
GROUPS INVOLVED IN PLANNING IN COUNTY 2

| Interview Guide (questions)                                                                                         | Responses |     |    |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----|----|-----|
|                                                                                                                     | Yes       | PI  | No | OT  |
| Did the planners that led to the production of the district comprehensive educational plan represent the following? |           |     |    |     |
| 1. County-level officials                                                                                           | 20        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 2. Individual schools                                                                                               | 9         | 90  | 1  | 10  |
| 3. Members of the Community                                                                                         | 4         | 40  | 6  | 50  |
| 4. Teachers                                                                                                         | 18        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 5. Students                                                                                                         | 4         | 40  | 4  | 50  |
| 6. Employer organizations                                                                                           | 0         | 0   | 20 | 200 |
| 7. Community Organizations                                                                                          | 3         | 30  | 7  | 70  |
| 8. Other                                                                                                            | 3         | 30  | 7  | 70  |

All county-level activities were said to be involved in the comprehensive planning in that each department was assigned a section of the comprehensive plan pertaining to their area. The office of the superintendent was involved only by determining that the Coordinator of Instructional Program would receive the assignment for coordinating the planning. The superintendent facilitated the planning as previously mentioned, by asking staff at the first meeting of all county-level staff and building principals that they were expected to cooperate with the Coordinator of Instructional Program in the comprehensive planning process. The superintendent made the decision not to participate beyond this point as he feared his participation would interfere with the planning activities. However, many writers would disagree with his rationale for nonparticipation. Cartwright, for example, in analyzing styles of leadership reported that,

... a number of groups having participatory leaders, as compared with those having supervisory leaders, expressed more satisfaction with the group's performance, felt the group's task to be more interesting, believed the group to be more efficient, and gave more weight to the attitudes of other members in forming their own opinions.<sup>1</sup>

All county-level activities were reportedly involved in the planning primarily in terms of identifying staffing and budget needs for the following year. All areas were asked to follow a format for reporting. The format required budget data such as personnel salaries, fixed charges, and equipment needs. In addition to this budget information, there was the requirement that each division and school respond

---

<sup>1</sup>Samuel Cartwright, "The Nature of Group Cohesiveness," *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*, p. 127

in terms of three categories: (1) Goal statement, (2) Learning Goals,  
 (3) Objectives, (4) Strategies, and (5) Evaluation.

Response to the specific question on the immediate guide

Appendix B showed that the other primary areas involved in curriculum planning were the individual schools and the teachers. Students, community organizations, and other areas such as parent-family groups were involved in only a very indirect manner. Although some parents affecting planning was said to be an example of student involvement, one such response was, "We have all students. We found deficiencies in language and computation. As a result of this, in comprehensive planning, we made provisions for these deficiencies."

Individual schools were reportedly involved in several ways. Principals discussed county-level staff meetings on comprehensive planning, and in some cases went to the district comprehensive educational planning meetings scheduled by the Florida State Department of Education. Principals invited area leaders or department heads who in turn involved classroom teachers in the planning. All schools were asked to submit staffing needs as well as other needs involving costs on a budget data form and all schools were asked to participate in the writing of a curriculum plan on two institutional levels. For example, the schools planned a curriculum for each in elementary grades K-6. These plans were turned over in the Department of Elementary Education who worked with them and the schools in preparing a curriculum plan suitable for all elementary schools. This completed plan was then turned over to the Coordinator of Institutional Programs. The curriculum plan

himself was not to become a part of the comprehensive planning document--the budget data form that was required in developing the comprehensive plan, and the creation of the curriculum plan that stated goals, content areas, strategies, and evaluation. This activity of budget building based on curriculum planning at the school level is consistent with good planning practices discussed by Jans. Jans writes that the hope of systematic planning is that, "... teachers and support staff will experiment with alternative programs."<sup>6</sup> He also suggests school personnel participating in building and allocating the budget. Of this Jans writes, "Program budgets are built on the assumption that schools identify their priorities in providing the educational package they offer."<sup>7</sup> As previously indicated, Chase also supports a decentralization of decision-making which he calls, "shared decisionmaking" which leads to a more effective utilization of human and material resources.<sup>8</sup>

#### Comprehensive Planning Committee

Interviewees reported that no committee was formed in district 4 for the specific purpose of engaging in comprehensive educational planning. When asked what committees were formed, one top-level staff person responded, "I did not formulate any." Another said, "Committees are ad hoc. If the person will take it out and do it a portion of a time, it will be simpler." Data indicates that even on the school level, the curriculum plans were drawn up by a group that

<sup>6</sup>Jans, p. 32

<sup>7</sup>Jans

<sup>8</sup>Jans

functioned as a task force as a long-range, non-consultative influence and after the planning which attended the county-level response for staffing information, budget information, and curriculum plans, however, according to Murphy and numerous other contributors, desirable planning should include means through which cooperative action is possible, and be backed up by leaders who understand and believe in cooperative procedures.<sup>8</sup> Murphy believes that, "the development of a sound educational program requires the best cooperative efforts of both educators and lay citizens."<sup>9</sup> He further states, "Persons involved in cooperative projects should be broadly representative of all points of view in the school or community."<sup>10</sup>

#### Division of Planning Functions

Table 4 shows that the respondents felt, in varying degrees, that the planning process provided greater flexibility to those who operate educational programs but at the same time made them more accountable for results. All responses to this statement, however, stated that, still in the "unmet" or "partial" category. As previously indicated, this reported balance of accountability and flexibility as associated with good comprehensive planning practices required

<sup>8</sup>Murphy, Brown, and Miller, Administrative Organization and Management, p. 189.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 144.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 141.

in the Florida State Department of Community, Home, and Comprehensive Educational Planning.<sup>12</sup>

40 percent reported not scheduled for responses to interview question 18, 'Allocated time was provided for staff sessions.' Although half of those interviewed said that allocated time was provided for staff sessions to engage in comprehensive educational planning, 40 percent reported that time was not provided. According to Jones, good planning practice would also provide for allocated time.<sup>13</sup>

The use of technical jargon in the planning process was not reported to be a problem. According to most authors of planning practice, this would be a good sign.<sup>14</sup>

According to the eleventh interview statement shared that respondents felt that the planning process did reveal that one point or group of persons was more expert in the planning process than others. The persons identified as more expert were the Coordinator of Institutional Programs, the Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance, the Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Personnel, and the Director of Vocational Education. This realization in planning ability could be a drawback to the planning process according to Gresh and she says, "A troubling aspect that was revealed pertains to collection of people designs the systematic techniques to be used in the planning and that someone or little team 'experts' than others who will plan with

---

<sup>12</sup>Goldstein, Section 2, p. 3.

<sup>13</sup>Jones, p. 20.

<sup>14</sup>Section and Jones, p. 1.

TABLE 4

## EVIDENCE OF PLANNING PRACTICE IN GROUP 1

| Interview Guide Statements                                                                                                                                             | Interview Guide Statement Indicators |     |                       |    |                      |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|----|----------------------|-----|
|                                                                                                                                                                        | no clear description                 |     | a partial description |    | not a description    |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                        | Responses<br>Percent                 |     | Responses<br>Percent  |    | Responses<br>Percent |     |
| 14. The planning process provided greater flexibility to than the specific educational programs but at the same time made them more accountable for results--          | 4                                    | 40  | 4                     | 40 | 0                    | 0   |
| 17. Believed that was provided for staff members                                                                                                                       | 1                                    | 60  | 1                     | 10 | 4                    | 60  |
| 18. Each technical person was used in the planning process.                                                                                                            | 0                                    | 30  | 1                     | 10 | 7                    | 70  |
| 19. The planning process revealed that the person in charge of persons who were expert in the planning process (see indicator)                                         | 1                                    | 60  | 2                     | 30 | 1                    | 30  |
| 20. The involvement and between interaction of a large number of people created interest                                                                               | 0                                    | 0   | 0                     | 0  | 10                   | 100 |
| 21. Revision was made in the planning process so that the results of earlier decisions could be revisited in order to make more effective future decisions             | 1                                    | 60  | 0                     | 60 | 0                    | 0   |
| 22. Interrelated systems in the administrative system were involved in policy making at the upper level in those matters that would affect those policies and programs | 0                                    | 60  | 1                     | 10 | 0                    | 10  |
| 23. Participants in the planning felt that some planning should not be disrupted                                                                                       | 0                                    | 0   | 1                     | 10 | 0                    | 60  |
| 24. Participants in the planning emphasized a feeling of social equality                                                                                               | 4                                    | 60  | 0                     | 60 | 0                    | 10  |
| 25. Organization in the planning was positive and non-defile                                                                                                           | 10                                   | 100 | 0                     | 0  | 0                    | 0   |

that portion of the vignette scenario that was<sup>12</sup> accurate, the majority of respondents in this study indicated that this was not a hindrance to the planning process. In one respondent put it, "The description of destructional program was more explicit and we were glad of it."

The data indicate that Study 2 did not involve a large number of persons in the comprehensive planning process. The respondents, of course, felt that the involvement and intense consultation of a large number of people did not create dissent. In the reader one can be sure that all respondents felt that interview statement III was<sup>13</sup> not a description of what occurred.<sup>14</sup> Research would perceive this lack of dissent as a sign of good planning and consensus for successful planning.<sup>15</sup>

Interviews in interview statement IV indicate that the process of feedback was a part of the comprehensive planning. Half the respondents said that the statement, "Feedback was made in the planning process so that the merits of earlier decisions could be evaluated in order to make more effective future decisions," was an exact description of what occurred, and half saw this statement as partially descriptive. As previously reported, this would be an indication of good planning practices according to description.<sup>16</sup>

Eight of the ten respondents felt that decision-making was decentralized so members that affected the program and policies of lower-

<sup>12</sup>Greiff, p. 33.

<sup>13</sup>Interview, p. 4.

<sup>14</sup>Greenfield, p. 18.

level systems. This is noted planning practice according to Japan. This suggests a planning approach in which lower-level systems are involved in policy-making. "[...] In those nations which will inherit the new policies and programs."<sup>22</sup>

Another very strong response was to the interview statement stating, "Participants in the comprehensive planning group"<sup>23</sup> felt that some planning could not be displaced.<sup>24</sup> One of the respondents reported that this was not a description of what occurred. In one respondent explained, "He was too afraid to express an opinion." This condition is compatible with good planning practice according to Japan who reported that, "Groups achieved these goals more readily than the deliberational pattern was not fixed."<sup>25</sup>

One of the respondents felt that the deliberative discussion, "Participants in the planning process displayed a feeling of social equality," was either totally or partially true. According to Murphy, "Individual members of the group feel the need for acceptance by other members. When individual needs as well as group needs are met, the organization is more productive."<sup>26</sup>

<sup>22</sup>Japan, p. 10.

<sup>23</sup>The word "group" was substituted for "committee" as response one in Exhibit C reported that no special committee or such was formed to engage in comprehensive planning.

<sup>24</sup>Robert C. Murphy, The Development and Implementation of a New Pattern of Leadership for Modernizing Education (Manuscript, University of Florida, Gaines, 1984), p. 124.

<sup>25</sup>Robert C. Murphy, Ben E. Jelen, and Theodore E. Miller (ed.), International Administrations: Concepts, Problems, and Society (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1984), p. 289.

The final statement in this section received a unanimous response; all respondents reported that cooperation in the planning was genuine and in good faith.

### What Role Is Comprehensive Planning

Each respondent reported that the publication, Guidelines for District Comprehensive Educational Planning was helpful to District 2 in planning. This publication did, at the outset, present some difficulties in interpretation, but when this was overcome, it served as a model from which the District developed its own policies to structure the planning and satisfy the mandate. One respondent described Guidelines as "very helpful" and went on to say that Guidelines, " . . . gave us some idea of what they [the State Department of Education] would approve and what they wanted from us." Another respondent said, " . . . Guidelines were very broad in we developed our own policies which included goals, needs, objectives, structure, and evaluation. "

Regional comprehensive planning seminars scheduled by the State Department of Education for the purpose of discussing comprehensive educational planning with District 2 and several other school districts were also spoken of favorably by the majority of respondents in school District 2. Existing planning models were reportedly made available for consideration by school districts; clarification was given concerning State Department requirements, and ideas were exchanged with persons from other districts-- as a result of the seminars, planners from District 2 reported that they felt they were "on solid ground" in the manner by which they were approaching comprehensive planning.

Finally he defined District 4 by State Department officials concerned with comprehensive planning also seemed to clarify State Department expectations. State Department personnel visited District 4 planners to discuss issues such as by suggesting narrative action long before the actual production of the planning document. One interesting comment made by a system level planner was, "They [State Department personnel] would look at what we were doing and tell us if the plan would satisfy the State Department. As I was not looking for detailed assistance, just general comments, this was very helpful."<sup>20</sup>

Comments on the role that the respondents wanted the Department of Education to play in comprehensive planning were varied. Some respondents suggested that the State Department play a stronger role by developing highly structured guidelines that would replace their districts' mostly ill-defined plans. Interviewees also suggested that districts be required to adhere strictly to the comprehensive plan once it was written. Other respondents felt that the State Department should continue to play the role that it was now playing, not providing this role as interpretation, advisory, and counseling. Interestingly, there was no suggestion of a lesser State Department role.

#### Planning in District 2

District 2 is a reform-based school district located in the north central portion of Florida. The population is composed of 79 percent white, 20.2 percent black, and an insignificant percent of others.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup>Interview #2222, pp. 206. Population Characteristics of Florida School Districts, p. 18.

The median school year increased to 11.5.<sup>13</sup> District D's population has increased 33.5 percent in the past ten years.<sup>14</sup> At the time of this writing, District D has enrolled some 4,000 students at 18 schools. The persons interviewed in District D were: County Superintendent of Schools, Supervisor of Pupil Personnel Services, Supervisor of Department Projects, principal of a high school, principal of an elementary school, department head of a middle school, curriculum coordinator of an elementary school, a classroom teacher in a middle school, and a principal/department member. An annotated version, an interview guide was developed and used. A copy of the interview guide is shown in Appendix A.

### Initial Priority in Planning

Upon learning of the Department's intent to emphasize comprehensive planning, the Superintendent of School District D wrote the requirements for comprehensive planning into the job description of the Supervisor of Pupil Personnel Services, and assigned the responsibility for planning to him. In the Superintendent's opinion, comprehensive planning in District D was lacking at most. Since District D was dissatisfied with their existing capacity for and understanding of the process of needs assessment, a university was requested to organize a three week needs assessment workshop for staff of the county-level staff and including some school principals, guidance counselors, and curriculum

<sup>13</sup> Id., p. 10.

<sup>14</sup> Id., p. 12.

manipulators. At the same time the workshop set basic, required, comprehensive planning procedures and requirements were being presented to principals and facilities by the superintendent and the supervisor of Pupil Personnel Services.

#### Beliefs for Development of Responsibility for Planning

The categories of responses were given. First, the supervisor of Pupil Personnel Services was reportedly given the responsibility for comprehensive planning because he was in charge of the testing program, and therefore aware of the needs and the problems associated with needs assessment. Secondly, he was the county-level person who had worked most closely with the faculty and staff of the individual schools. As the respondent said, "In this county, the person in charge of pupil personnel works closely with facilities and is most aware of needs and testing programs." Another reported, "I talked more with him about needs more than any other person."

#### Extent of Participation in Planning

Table 5 shows the responses to questions about the levels and the nature of participation in comprehensive educational planning. The responses to questions 5 show that there was strong agreement that county-level offices, individual schools, and teachers were involved in the planning, and complete agreement that employee organizations and community organizations were not involved in the planning. The opinion on whether or not members of the community were involved was divided. Eight of the respondents reported that students were not involved in

the planning. None of the respondents could name any other areas that were involved.

TABLE 3  
AREA INVOLVED IN PLANNING IN CLEVELAND

| Interview Source Question   | Response |     |    |     |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----|----|-----|
|                             | Total    | Yes | No | %   |
| 1. County-level offices     | 20       | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 2. Individual schools       | 10       | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 3. Portion of the community | 5        | 20  | 3  | 60  |
| 4. Business                 | 9        | 50  | 4  | 44  |
| 5. Farmers                  | 2        | 0   | 2  | 100 |
| 6. Employee organizations   | 0        | 0   | 10 | 100 |
| 7. Community organizations  | 0        | 0   | 10 | 100 |
| 8. Other                    | 0        | 0   | 10 | 100 |

There was general agreement in response concerning the involvement or noninvolvement of all areas except that of the community. This conflict of information can probably be explained by examining the respondents' view of what constituted involvement. Some interviewees felt that members of the community by the act of responding to questionnaires were involved in the planning, whereas, others did not consider this activity to be involvement.

That type of responsibility for planning was another to the frustration of many workers in the field of planning who call for more involvement. For example, Wright, as previously indicated, feels that planning should involve all of those associated with the progress of the planning process.<sup>28</sup> However, in County 3 there was reportedly little or no involvement in several critical areas.

Respondents were asked to explain the nature of involvement of the reportedly involved areas. The Superintendent was said to be directly involved in the planning from the outset. One respondent said, "The [the Superintendent] headed it up from the beginning and took a personal interest in it. He sets personal plans with the school-level personnel to see how they were doing." Another respondent said of the Superintendent, "We attended most of the comprehensive planning meetings, and was very much in touch with what was going on." A third said, "The Superior Council and the Director of Pupil Personnel Services took to every school and showed Filasofiya and talked to staffs about the importance of planning." It is clear that the Superintendent legitimated the comprehensive planning mainly by his direct and continued involvement in it. According to Erickson, such involvement on the part of the Superintendent is critical to the success of important educational change. Speaking of participation of the Superintendent and other local administrators, Erickson writes, "there are . . . many superintendents who are obstacles in progress. But the poor influence of those who have a sense of urgency

<sup>28</sup> Wright, p. 33.

about change in *Wells and his* little group may be more effective than might else be *imaging* *May* the 'Wind-pollens' -<sup>27</sup>

The county offices of the Department of Public Personnel Services, in addition to providing the services mentioned in the above paragraph, furnished guidelines of best practice, coordinated the planning for the entire district, met with school-level and county-level personnel separately, and was available for assistance at any time.

The other county-level offices that were heavily involved in the planning was expected to be the Division of Finance. The Division of Finance participated mainly at the county level by providing the other divisions with cost-analysis data necessary for planning.

All county-level offices were involved in the planning by supplying information to the Department of Public Personnel Services in terms of six categories. The form that was provided was identical for all academic and support offices and was organized into six categories of: (1) Goal Statement, (2) Action, (3) Goals/Outcomes, (4) Long-range Objectives, (5) Short-range Objectives, and (6) Evaluation.

Financial in each school were asked by the Department to submit an individual comprehensive plan that showed their needs and the solutions to those needs over the next several years. Participants in each school conducted a needs assessment survey to determine needs before

<sup>27</sup>Wells J. Clayton, "Local Responsibility, Responsibility, and Responsibility in Planning." *Planning for Effective Implementation of Technology in Education, especially Education for All People*. An Eight-Week Project, edited by Clayton and Wells in Denver, Colorado. Westwood Publishing, 1981, p. 171.

They began to produce the comprehensive plan. The principals of the five schools devised as a planning condition to produce the needs assessment instrument, and to serve as liaison between county-level and school-level planning. The needs assessment instrument grew out of the State Board of Education standards, and was accepted by the majority of teachers and a few members of the community. Members of the community were not reportedly involved in the planning beyond working on the needs assessment instrument.

In the elementary schools there was said to be total involvement. The principal served as the coordinator for comprehensive planning, but with the assistance of the teachers, produced the document that was sent to the Department of Public Personnel Services. As a result of the needs assessment information, determination was made that math and reading skills were the main areas that needed improvement, "Needed Improvements." Each of the elementary grades, K - 4, had the responsibility for analyzing where they were and where they wanted to be in terms of math and reading skills. In addition to producing reading and math objectives, the grade levels participated in setting short-range (one year) plans and long-range (five year) plans for the realization of these objectives. These plans were written in the format of the previously mentioned items as: (I) Goal Statement, (II) Status, (III) Needed Improvements, (IV) Long-range Objectives, (V) Short-range Objectives, and (VI) Evaluation.

The middle schools and the high schools organized the planning in terms of curriculum areas. After doing the needs assessment survey, each department produced a plan for the department in the format of:

(1) Goal Statement, (2) Purpose, (3) Overall Objectives, (4) Long-range Objectives, (5) Short-range Objectives, and (6) Final Plan. The comprehensive plans from middle schools and high schools were not the result of broad involvement, but were reportedly produced almost exclusively by curriculum coordinators and department heads. The comprehensive plans of the schools were presented to the supervision of Pupil Personnel Services who used them as a basis for the comprehensive plan that he produced and presented to the Department of Education.

#### Comprehensive Planning Committees

Much effort about the formation and use of comprehensive planning committees in planning, respondents talked of the Instructional Advisory Council, the Guidance and Curriculum Coordinator Council, the Principals' Steering Committee, and the Top Advisory Committee.

However, data indicate that only one of these, the Principals' Steering Committee, was formed for the purpose of taking part in comprehensive planning as the sole purpose (see definition of terms, Chapter I). Even so, due to inconsistent attendance, the Principals' Steering Committee was reportedly anchored by the curriculum assistants who ultimately broke the planning chains of the schools. The Instructional Advisory Council was mainly concerned with evaluation of programs, the Guidance and Curriculum Council with data collection, and the Top Advisory Council with consultation of school system policies to communities of District 5. None of the above groups combined lay and school district personnel, as indicated in Chapter II. This is the type of organization for planning that Epstein wants say give rise to comprehensive planning committees;

Students, parents, community groups and other identity groups are often lost in the maze of bureaucracy and red tape. I believe some type of advisory planning is necessary to help these people make their voices heard and to help them navigate the bureaucratic maze.<sup>40</sup>

Interviews further revealed that the Instructional Advisory Council, the Guidance and Curriculum Coordinator Council and the Lay Advisory Committee had been formed several years previous to the advent of comprehensive planning. The groups were formed by several methods. The members of the Instructional Advisory Council were appointed by the Principals of the schools, the membership of the Guidance and Curriculum Council was determined by position—it was composed of all of the guidance counselors and curriculum coordinators in the district, the Principals' Planning Committee was originally composed of the school principals, but, as previously mentioned, attended solely by Texas delegates who were usually curriculum stakeholders. The Lay Advisory Committee was formed by appointment of the school board but had the power to add to its roster. Its membership was composed of business people and parents and reportedly was broadly representative both economically and racially.

All of the above discussed groups were advisory to the board and functioned mainly in terms of reviewing plans and programs and making recommendations.

#### Review of Planning Processes

As shown in Table 4, the majority of the respondents felt that the planning process provided greater flexibility to planners and made

<sup>40</sup>Logan, p. 31.

# TABLE 4

## STATEMENTS OF PLANNING PRACTICE IN COUNTY 2

| Descriptive Study Statements                                                                                                                                             | Interview Study Responses/Agreements |    |                       |    |                      |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----|-----------------------|----|----------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                          | no direct description                |    | a partial description |    | not a description    |    |
|                                                                                                                                                                          | Responses<br>Percent                 |    | Responses<br>Percent  |    | Responses<br>Percent |    |
| 18. The planning process provided greater flexibility to those who operate administrative programs but at the same time sets them more accountable for results.          | 3                                    | 75 | 0                     | 00 | 2                    | 50 |
| 17. Reduced time was provided for study sessions.                                                                                                                        | 7                                    | 70 | 1                     | 10 | 2                    | 50 |
| 18. Rank technique (target) was used in the planning process.                                                                                                            | 3                                    | 30 | 0                     | 0  | 5                    | 70 |
| 19. The planning process provided that one primary or group of persons who were experts in the planning process take others.                                             | 0                                    | 00 | 0                     | 00 | 5                    | 50 |
| 20. The involvement and intensive information of a large number of people created distrust.                                                                              | 0                                    | 0  | 2                     | 50 | 0                    | 00 |
| 21. Provision was made in the planning process so that the results of studies, decisions could be integrated in order to take more effective future decisions.           | 4                                    | 40 | 1                     | 10 | 1                    | 10 |
| 22. Lower level options in the administrative system were developed in policy making at the upper level in those entities that would select their policies and programs. | 4                                    | 40 | 1                     | 10 | 2                    | 50 |
| 23. Participants in the planning felt that some decisions could not be displaced.                                                                                        | 3                                    | 30 | 0                     | 0  | 0                    | 00 |
| 24. Participants in the planning displayed a feeling of mental equality.                                                                                                 | 0                                    | 00 | 1                     | 10 | 0                    | 0  |
| 25. Cooperation in the planning was greater and more stable.                                                                                                             | 5                                    | 50 | 2                     | 20 | 0                    | 0  |

It was remarkable for simplicity. Some of the responses were recorded in the "naïveté" category. As previously indicated, such naivete of estimability and flexibility is consistent with good comprehensive planning practice according to the Florida State Department of Education.<sup>29</sup>

The majority of respondents also reported that naivete did not prevent but aided members to engage in comprehensive educational planning. Some of the respondents completely agreed with the statement in that effort, but partially agreed, and two disagreed.

Response to interview statement 18 indicated that the use of technical jargon in the planning process was not a problem. As previously indicated, this would be detrimental to effective planning. As Earl and MacLin explain, "there must be a 'common language' so that the process concerned can communicate; the terms must have approximate the same to all."<sup>30</sup>

Respondents also generally felt that the planning process did reveal a discrepancy in planning ability among participants. Some of the respondents felt that this was true because, "The members of the planning group were from various levels in the county such as county-level staff, curriculum coordinators, and teachers." Another qualified his initial response by adding, "Some made more progress than others."

<sup>29</sup>Guidelines, Section 1, p. 2

<sup>30</sup>Harold E. Earl and Herbert E. MacLin, "Careful Approval Is Needed," Florida Commission For Higher Public Schools: The Public High Schools of the National Society for the Study of Education, Volume 4, Number 41, Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1960, p. 307

As previously mentioned, Gresh reported that such a variation in planning ability could be a hindrance to the planning process.<sup>11</sup>

The data indicates that Group D did not involve a large number of persons in the planning process. As would be expected, the majority of respondents reacted negatively to the statement, "The involvement and intense interaction of a large number of people in planning created stress." Eight respondents reported that this was not descriptive and as was reported that it was.

Eight of the ten respondents indicated that the process of feedback was a part of the representative planning process. Seven talks of feedback as a way a system improves itself which would represent a characteristic of effective planning.<sup>12</sup>

Interview statement 17 generated a confused response. Only six of the respondents felt that decentralization was decentralized as policies that affected the policies and programs of instructional systems. Ten felt that this was partially the case and the remaining two reported that decision-making was not decentralized. As indicated in the literature search, Ray Wilkins in the field of educational planning says the involvement of many levels of planners in decision-making. Kemerich, for example, says, "Total involvement of all segments of the educational system - > - to insure more productive inputs."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup>Gresh, p. 33

<sup>12</sup>James, p. 28

<sup>13</sup>Barry J. Kemerich, "Systems breakthrough in educational leadership development programs," Developing Alternatives to Meet Growing Needs: Preparing Education for the Future. An Independent Study by Edgar L. Marget and Mark L. Jenson and Others, Columbia: The National Forum, Inc., 1981, p. 101.

A substantial majority of respondents said that the statement, "Participants in the planning felt that some planners would not be disappointed," was not a description of what occurred while only two respondents agreed that it was. In one interviewee put it, "They [the participants] in the planning were disappointed less and less." He previously indicated, planning is said to be effective when the intermediate problems in planning is not time.<sup>14</sup>

None of the respondents felt that the interview statement, "Participants in the planning process displayed a feeling of social equality," was an exact description of what occurred with the remaining interviewees agreed that it was partially true. This atmosphere of social equality characterizes effective planning. As mentioned earlier, Murphy writes of this feeling of social equality as a condition for the achievement of this feeling is related to the feeling of social equality and is limited to the feeling of social equality.<sup>15</sup>

The final statement in this section stated responses which were evenly divided between the "social" and "partial" conditions. Half the respondents said that cooperation was good and in good faith while the remaining half was that it was partially the case. The data indicates that in the majority of instances in which District 5 the process was in fact characterized by good faith planning.

#### Role Role in Comprehensive Planning

##### Subdivisions for District Comprehensive Educational Planning was

<sup>14</sup> Murphy, p. 186.

<sup>15</sup> Murphy, p. 187.

not generally reported as being helpful in school districts is in their planning. Hinesius reported that Guidelines was hard to interpret and meaningless at the school of the planning. One respondent felt that Guidelines was "not adequate" or "of minimal use." One of the more positive responses was, "They were clearly unhelpful given as a jumping-off point." Another respondent explained that Guidelines became meaningful only after School District 5 had been involved in the planning process for several months. As he reported, "In retrospect they were pretty good, but at first they weren't that meaningful and didn't give us much sense of direction. We had to get involved before they had much meaning." Another respondent attributed the inadequacy that he perceived in Guidelines as possibly resulting from the lack of the school district's planning expertise. The data indicate that Guidelines was of minimal use to School District 5.

Final Reports were reviewed in the interview question, "How useful to your district's comprehensive educational planning were the resources developed by the State Department of Education's Region Comprehensive Planning Committee?" One interviewee answered, "Really useless. They [Department of Education officials] were asking more information than they were willing to give." Another reported, "We knew less when we left." A third told the researcher that the final results was extremely confusing and the following sentence was, "... something but not very helpful." As previously indicated, school district 5 contacted numerous officials and requested the use comprehensive planning workshop. One respondent answered the question by saying, "Less helpful than the workshops we usually followed. The State

Respondent people had ~~different~~ ~~understanding~~ ~~about~~ comprehensive planning.<sup>7</sup> In addition, the comprehensive planning sessions scheduled and conducted by the Florida State Department of Education were not perceived as helpful by the planners in school District 6.

Responses to the twenty-eighth interview question were consistent. The majority of respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the skills of the school districts by Department of Education officials concerned with comprehensive planning. However, those of the respondents reported Democratic visits from these visits. One such Democratic response was, "They helped clarify what was expected of us." Another respondent named a Department of Education person and described him as, "a ~~very~~ ~~Franklin~~, ~~sort~~ ~~him~~." The negative responses indicated that such visits were of "minimal" use as had "no effect at all." One respondent said, "The Department of Education officials didn't know any more than ~~themselves~~ told them."

Consistent on the role that the respondents wanted the Florida State Department of Education to play in comprehensive planning was varied. Several respondents felt that the Department of Education should play a stronger role by providing consultants who could interpret the intent of the legislature to the school districts in clear and specific terms. Respondents felt that such consultants should be well versed in the conceptualization and implementation of comprehensive planning. Respondents also suggested that the Department of Education play a more active role. A respondent was made that advisory workshops should be provided by the Department of Education for teachers as well as curriculum staff, and that, after these initial workshops, resource persons

should be made available to the school district upon request. The theme consistent in the responses was a desire for a stronger state role that would be advisory but not authoritarian.

At the time of the interview several respondents offered additional comments. Two talked of the inadequacy of the state summer work portion of the comprehensive planning and indicated that more effective needs assessment would be done the following year. Another respondent stated that enough planning had been done by the Department of Education before sending information to school districts. Yet another indicated that there was a feeling of resentment that the planning had been initiated rather than requested or requested.

#### Comparative Analysis of Comprehensive Planning in Two School Districts

The demographic information presented at the beginning of each of these case studies shows that the two school districts under examination are similar in several ways such as population, number of schools, and county-level school administrative organization. Both school districts received notice of the mandate to engage in comprehensive planning at approximately the same time and both received the same type of planning literature from the Florida State Department of Education. The resulting organization and administration in these two urban-sized school districts was characterized by both similar and dissimilar activities.

As previously reported, superintendents in both the urban-sized districts assigned the responsibility for comprehensive planning to a county-level division head--in school district C this was the Coordinator of Instructional Programs, and in school district B the Superintendent of pupil Personnel Services. The data indicate that the

assignment of 1949 was the first of the Superintendent's attempt of comprehensive planning. Mr. Superintendent in School District C determined that comprehensive planning should be coordinated by a person who had had experience in planning procedures, who had face-to-face contact with the schools, and who was thought of as an instructional leader than administrative person. The Coordinator of Instructional Program was selected for the job because he had these qualifications. The Superintendent of District C also determined that there be open lines of communication between the person responsible for comprehensive planning and the schools. As the Superintendent in District C visualized comprehensive planning as a process based on needs assessment, he further required that the person coordinating the planning be aware of needs, not the difficulties inherent in the assessment of needs. The Supervisor of pupil Personnel Services was in charge of the learning program, aware of needs, and well known by the schools. Because of this, the Superintendent expected him to coordinate comprehensive planning.

At this point the superintendent made several coordinating administrative decisions. The Superintendent in School District C decided to call all county-level office heads and all building principals together for the purpose of instituting the planning, announcing the appointment of the Coordinator of Instructional Program as planning coordinator, and explaining his desire for their complete cooperation with the Coordinator of Instructional Program. The Superintendent also made the decision not to readily participate in further planning as he felt his position would detract from the proposed instructional emphasis of the planning. As outlined by the Superintendent of School District C,

the comprehensive planning effort in schools currently important, implemented only by Florida State Department of Education suggestions, publications, and resources.

The Superintendent of School District 2 also called a meeting of county office heads and school-level administrators. However, he implemented the planning by personally visiting involved schools. The Supervisor of School Personnel Services was introduced as the coordinator of comprehensive planning and the superintendent made it clear that both he and the supervisor of pupil personnel services would come to schools for the purpose of presenting the planning concepts to the faculties. Additionally, the superintendent and the supervisor of pupil personnel services announced that they were in the process of constructing university personnel to come from the county and organize a workshop on systematic planning with emphasis on needs assessment.

The comprehensive planning that followed their organizational activities involved several levels in the school system. Superintendents in both school districts strongly agreed that the planning involved county-level officials, individual schools, and teachers. Although a few interviewees in each of the two school districts said that students and members of the community were involved, the supervisor data indicated that in both districts this was only peripheral involvement in the activity of responding to questionnaires or surveys.

Both school district 1 and school district 2 engaged the county-level staff, including principals and other selected school personnel in training sessions for the purpose of clarifying the planning philosophy to support the supervisor in supervising the planning. Another important supervisor experience in systematic planning, school district

It called on Department of Education publications, regional comprehensive planning seminars, and visits by State Department officials join the already existing county knowledge of planning to educate staff and derive strategy. School District 2, in contrast, made intensive plans to equip outside consultants to organize an intensive comprehensive planning workshop for the first portion of the school year.

In a review of the initial training session, both School Districts 2 and 3 began to participate in needs assessment activities. The needs assessment instruments and procedures were very similar in the two districts. Both school districts constructed their own needs assessment forms and both administered these forms to students, faculty, and some members of the community. Also, both districts expressed dissatisfaction with their needs assessment instruments. County 3 felt that only opinions had been discovered and not actual needs and County 2 complained that they had relied too heavily on generalization standards when constructing their needs assessment instrument. The complaint here was that generalization needs were not actual needs. Similarly, both school districts supplemented the results of the needs assessment findings with standardized test scores. The comprehensive planning that followed was therefore, in both school districts, influenced primarily by training sessions and needs assessment activities.

Subsequent to these needs assessment activities, the planning in the two school districts varied. The Superintendent of Instructional Program of School District 2 asked all county-level officials to participate in comprehensive planning by identifying staffing and other budgetary needs and by reporting to him in writing in terms of the five

previously mentioned categories are: (1) Goal Statement, (2) Learner Needs, (3) Objectives, (4) Strategies, and (5) Evaluation. Schools were also required to do this in addition to participating in the preparation of a curriculum plan for each designated subject area. This type of activity required that the county-level offices of Finance and Personnel cooperate with schools and with other county-level offices in the preparation of staffing and budgeting needs, and, in a like manner, county-level instructional area supervisors cooperated with the schools in the preparation of the curriculum plans. All of this activity was coordinated by the Coordinator of Instructional Programs.

In School District 5 the planning emphasis was not on budget and staffing and county-level offices, such as finance and personnel, did not furnish information to the schools. All county-level offices did report to the Department of Public Personnel Services in comparison, in this case via, which is previously mentioned were: (1) Goal Statement, (2) Needs, (3) Instructional Objectives, (4) Language Objectives, (5) Short-range Objectives, and (6) Evaluation. Schools in School District 5 were asked individually to submit an entire comprehensive educational plan which identified needs and the solutions to those needs over the next several years.

The data would indicate, therefore, that in the case of School District 5, only a few persons in each school were involved--primarily administration plus the teachers in the instructional area for which their curriculum plan was being written. In School District 5 approximately all areas in all schools, the involvement was more complete.

The use of a district-wide ~~comprehensive~~ planning committee was not a significant aspect of comprehensive planning in either of the nation's school districts. School District C reported that in fact none was formed for that purpose. At various times some of the same persons came together as a group, but this did not constitute a committee with community-wide participatory emphasis, rather it was a group of individuals who had interests in one area or school. School District D was closest to establishing a comprehensive planning committee with its appointment of school principals as a steering committee for planning. This committee did not, however, function with a community-wide perspective. In fact, the data indicate that by and large the membership was dominated by curriculum specialists who were school rather than district oriented.

The actual comprehensive documents which were presented to the Department of Education were very similar even though various aspects of the planning, as outlined above, were different. Both School District C and D presented documents in the same which incorporated the categorical listings of goals, strategies, etc., but did not include any of the curriculum plans. Both districts included some budgetary information but in terms of broad categories such as instructional or maintenance rather than in program or line-item form.

School Districts C and D were reportedly similar when required to statements of education as instructional planning practice. The planning process in both school districts was generally characterized by providing greater flexibility accompanied by increased accountability. The amount of released time provided by School District C was apparently less than that given by School District D. Data revealed that in fact School District

It provided substitute teachers so that selected school personnel could participate in the county comprehensive planning work outlined earlier. No such arrangement was reported for School District C.

Members of the School District's planning reported that the use of juries was a problem in the planning. On the other hand, planners in both school districts reported that some participants were more active in the planning process than others, but did not indicate that this was a drawback to the planning process. Both also indicate that participation was high in the planning process of both school districts for feedback and the development of the various levels in the school system in policy making. Additionally, the planning in both School District C and B was reportedly characterized by uninhibited participation and genuine cooperation.

Although School District C, as described, made use of suggested effective planning procedures to a greater extent than School District B, by means of using outside consultants and teacher based school level planning work, both school districts made significant use of effective planning procedures as reflected in the planning literature.

Perceptions of the Florida State Department of Education's role in comprehensive planning by the two school districts were quite different. Both school districts experienced difficulty in the interpretation of Guidelines. School District C, after receiving this initial difficulty of interpretation, indicated that the report was helpful especially by serving as a model for planning and indicating what the Florida State Department of Education desired. School District B also came to understand Guidelines, but their generally determined that to be of almost no use.

The proposed workshop memorandum<sup>1</sup> to Florida State Department met with much resistance by primary principals. The resistance gave planners in School District C a feeling of "being in the right trench," and provided them with what they described as "strongly viable" for planning. In contrast, School District D reported that these proposed meetings were not beneficial to planning and that their own workshop was superior to that of the state.

School District C also experienced satisfaction with the results of visits made to the school district by Florida State Department of Education officials concerned with comprehensive planning. As mentioned earlier, these visits were characterized with clarifying state expectations, and the elimination of excess work by means of suggested connections in the planning process. Even so, the majority of responses to School District D indicated that the visits were of little use.

Both School District C and D had similar opinions as to what role the Florida State Department of Education should play in comprehensive planning. Neither school district suggested a lesser role. In fact, both indicated that a stronger role be played. Responses to School District D, for example, called for more highly structured guidelines, state supervision of implementation of comprehensive plans, and the continuing advisory and consulting role which District D planners reported the need for more knowledgeable consultants, in-service workshops, and greater availability of personnel to visit the district.

#### CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The data about comprehensive planning in School District C and School District D were discussed in this chapter. Both school

districts were attempting in an organizational year to engage in effective planning. Both were making strides in that direction, and, in most instances, were adopting an effective planning plan superior to selected standards from the planning literature.

Although the two school districts felt differently about the influence of the Florida State Department of Education in their planning, both saw a need for state participation. The data indicate that the state should play a strong but advisory role in comprehensive planning.

Guidelines for Comprehensive Educational Planning greatly influenced the format of comprehensive planning in both school district C and D even though one of them felt that Guidelines was of little use. This is demonstrated by the interest of both school districts in state assessment and emphasis on goals and objectives both of which are parts of the state's officially adopted "change strategy."

Another strong influence on the comprehensive planning in each district was the interpretation of Guidelines by top administrative personnel. In County C the interpretation was heavily loaded toward the financial aspect of comprehensive planning. As the Superintendent of Instructional Program and the head of the Division of Finance were heavily involved in the planning, the planning became based on personnel and other budgetary needs with a lesser emphasis on curriculum planning. County D put the emphasis on state assessment and the identification of strategies to reduce the discrepancy between what they had and what they needed. In a like manner, the comprehensive plan de-emphasized budgetary information and emphasized such things as goals, objectives, strategies and evaluation.

CHAPTER V  
COMPARATIVE PLANNING IN TWO SELECTED  
LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Introduction

The manner in which two large school districts organize and administer comprehensive educational planning is the subject of this chapter. For the purpose of simplicity, these school districts are identified as School District H and School District F. Subsequent to a case study of each of these two districts, they will be compared in terms of the expectations and consummation of the planning process.

Planning in School District H

School District H is a large school district located on the lower east coast of Florida. The Superintendent reported that the population is distributed with 55 percent black, 31.4 percent Spanish-American and 13.6 percent the balance (Caucasian white, Oriental, and Indian). Because of this distribution, the school district gives no majority groups and is described by local government officials as being, "bilingual, tri-ethnic," and composed solely of three minority groups. The nation's school year completed is 12 1/2<sup>1</sup> and the population has increased 31.3 percent in the past ten years.<sup>2</sup> At the time of this

---

<sup>1</sup>Florida Dept. of Ed., 1980. Florida Characteristics of Florida School Districts, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup>USA, p. 13.

writing, School District 1 has enrolled over 240,000 students at approximately 240 schools. The person interviewed in School District 2 was Superintendent of Schools, Minnesota Superintendent for Instruction, Director of Comprehensive Educational Planning, assistant for special studies, finance officer, executive secretary to the Associate Superintendant for Instruction, two school board members, and two geographic area PTA presidents.

As indicated earlier, an interview guide was developed and used. A copy of the interview guide is shown in Appendix A.

### Initial Activity in Planning

There were some variations in opinions of the first significant action taken. Several informants saw the appointment of the Associate Superintendent for Instruction to coordinate the planning as the first significant action, whereas several others claimed that the sending of a delegation to Tallahassee to participate with the Florida State Department of Education in the production of Guidelines was the first significant action. Another respondent reported the calling together of the superintendent's administrative council for the purpose of discussing the matter as the initial significant activity. The data indicate no clear sequence of these activities into a chronological sequence. For purposes of discussion, the writer reports that several important actions were taken almost simultaneously as a result of the comprehensive planning initiative. These significant actions include the appointment of the Associate Superintendent for Instruction as comprehensive planning coordinator, the calling together of the two geographic area superintendents and county office-level divisions heads (see

Administration Council, and the acceptance of the invitation from the People's World Department of Education to participate in the writing of guidelines.

#### Initiative for Assignment of Responsibility for Planning

Several factors reportedly led to the decision to give the Associate Superintendent for Instruction the ultimate responsibility for the coordination of comprehensive planning. The Associate Superintendent for Instruction served as the state-level monitor that wrote Guidelines, he had had experience working with community groups, and was a member of the Superintendent's Administrative Cabinet. That he had the experience to undertake the planning assignment was also given as an explanation for the assignment.

One of the interviewees carried the title of director of comprehensive Educational Planning. However, this person was appointed by the Associate Superintendent for Instruction to assist him during the organizational part of comprehensive planning, and was not in fact the coordinator of comprehensive planning, but served as the Associate Superintendent's assistant during the first year of planning. After this, she returned to her former job as high school principal.

As indicated in the literature search, planning should be given a place of prominence in the system either by assigning it to a person in a responsible position or by promoting the person in charge of planning to a position of prominence.<sup>3</sup> Indeed District 8 apparently satisfied both halves of Nagam's suggestion by assigning the ultimate

---

<sup>3</sup>Nagam, p. 38.

responsibility to the American Psychological Association and presenting the killed Director of Comprehensive Educational Planning to his office.

#### Extent of Participation in Planning

From the previous interview questions E, as reported in Table 3, the reader can see that there was complete agreement that county-level officers, members of the community, community organizations, and students were involved in the comprehensive planning. Six of the respondents indicated that individual schools were involved in the planning but four reported that they were not. In this regard, seven of the interviewees reported that teachers were involved and three said that they were not. A substantial majority, nine of the ten interviewees, reported that employee organizations were not involved in comprehensive planning.

Respondents were asked in interview question F to outline the extent of involvement of the county-level officers. Respondents identified the most completely involved offices as the Public Information Office, the Division of Finance, and the Division of Instruction. In commenting on the involvement of the Public Information Office and the Division of Finance, one respondent said,

The Public Information Office assisted in the needs assessment survey, in community meetings, and in the preparation of the comprehensive educational planning document in terms of design and notation. The Finance Department assisted by virtue of the FPEO structure by preparing programs, by participating in all meetings, and in the budget survey.

All respondents talked of the role of the Division of Instruction in planning. This division was reported to be responsible for the

gathering of baseline information and, in each case, working with the all-BOC advisory comprehensive planning committee, and determining what the committee needed to consider. The Division of Instruction was further responsible for supplying the results of its actions of this committee plus the preparation of the comprehensive planning document. As was previously explained, "The Division of Instruction had the responsibility for preparing the plan, having it approved by the Superintendent's Administrative Cabinet, and submitting it to the school board for approval."

The data also indicate that all county-level office divisions were involved in preparing a program budget for their areas, by responding to planning questions for the upcoming year, and by making recommendations to the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction. Additionally, all county-level office divisions assigned persons within their staffs to act in an advisory capacity to the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction. The program budgets were prepared at the district office level, and, as required, reflected only a minimum of information. For example, program information about the instructional areas of art, business education, foreign languages, home economics, industrial arts, languages arts, mathematics, music, physical education, science, and social studies for middle schools and junior high schools required only two pages for presentation in the planning document. The information was reported under the main heading of "General Information," and under the subheadings of "Program Initiatives and Budget," and "Functions and Relative Costs." In this basic format, all school district-level offices were required to submit a general and brief introductory statement of

TABLE 10. *Questionnaire Results*

| Interview Guide Questions                                                                                               | Responses |     |    |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----|----|-----|
|                                                                                                                         | Yes       | (%) | No | (%) |
| 1. The planning that led to the production of the district representative educational plan required the involvement of: |           |     |    |     |
| 1. Community offices                                                                                                    | 10        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 2. Individual schools                                                                                                   | 8         | 80  | 2  | 20  |
| 3. Members of the community                                                                                             | 10        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 4. Students                                                                                                             | 3         | 30  | 7  | 70  |

Source: J.

TABLE 8

STATEMENTS BY SUBJECTS, PRACTICE 28, COURSE C

| Interview Guide Statements                                                                                                                                  | Interview Guide Statement Responses |    |                       |    |                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|-----------------------|----|-------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                             | no exact description                |    | a partial description |    | not a description |    |
|                                                                                                                                                             | Responses Percent                   |    | Responses Percent     |    | Responses Percent |    |
| 26. The planning process provided greater flexibility to those who operate educational programs but at the same time held them more accountable for results | 0                                   | 0% | 0                     | 0% | 0                 | 0% |
| 27. Reduced time was provided for staff members                                                                                                             | 8                                   | 80 | 2                     | 20 | 0                 | 0% |
| 28. More technical support was used in the planning process                                                                                                 | 3                                   | 30 | 4                     | 40 | 7                 | 70 |
| 29. The planning process involved both one person or group of persons who were experts in the planning process (and others)                                 | 5                                   | 50 | 0                     | 0% | 5                 | 50 |

handling the work aspect of Comprehensive Planning in two volumes of "Program Initiatives and Budget," and "Facilities and Evaluation Series."

Answers to the eighth question indicated the manner in which schools, teachers, members of the community, and students were involved in comprehensive planning. The data indicate that individual schools were involved in comprehensive planning only by reacting to proposals which had been previously prepared by the Division of Instruction. Teachers, for example, in a few selected schools were allowed to read and react to a plan prepared by the Division of Instruction called "Proposed Sizing Procedures for Comprehensive Schoolwide Planning." These reactions were given to their respective principals who made recommendations for future planning procedures to the principals and superintendents who in turn made recommendations to the Associate Superintendent for Instruction.

Members of the community were involved in the planning by serving on the County-Wide Comprehensive Educational Planning Committee. A description of the organization and function of this committee will be discussed later.

Although all respondents agreed that students were involved in the comprehensive planning, further investigation revealed that their involvement was minimal. Of the 148,000 students in School District E, only 8 participated in planning. They were all high school students and were selected by principals to serve on the County-Wide Comprehensive Educational Planning Committee.

### Comprehensive Educational Planning

History file indicated that the first county-wide comprehensive educational planning meeting was begun with two of two advisory committees. One of these committees, the Community Advisory Committee, had been selected by the school board in School District I and had been working from a variety of community organizations and all six geographic area parent-teacher associations. The Staff Advisory Committee was organized by the Associate Superintendent for Instruction, and included school district office-level administrators, administrators locally principal from the six geographic areas. The original intent of the school system was that there would be two comprehensive planning committees--one staff committee headed by the Associate Superintendent for Instruction, and one community committee chaired by the Director of Comprehensive Educational Planning. However, the events of the first county-wide meeting led to the decision to consolidate these two committees. In the first meeting, after the general session, the two committees went to separate meeting rooms. The members of the Community Comprehensive Educational Committee agreed upon their separation and asked the Director of Comprehensive Educational Planning, "What are they talking about in that other room?" The Associate Superintendent for Instruction was sent a message to this effect through his immediately assigned the two committees that was which was named the District-wide Comprehensive Educational Planning Committee.

When asked how the school system contributed to the planning work was done by the District-wide Comprehensive Educational Planning Committee, one respondent told, "The school system organized the group,

were responsible for meetings, served as secretary of the group, and published its reports.<sup>1</sup> Another said, "The school system . . . prepared minutes for the group to review and responded to questions and comments."

Responses to interview question 13 indicated that the system-wide philosophy and goals were produced by the District-wide Cooperative Educational Planning Committee. Other reported activities of the committee included the creation and administration of a pilot needs assessment survey, a review of a previously written study vocational education study, and review of financial information and test data. As previously mentioned, the committee also examined a study proposal for exploring planning procedures and made recommendations concerning future planning activities.

Both districts the membership of the District-wide Cooperative Educational Planning Committee were selected at the outset and they were not an advisory committee that would function for one year, and would be advisory to the local school board.

### Review of Planning Processes

As seen in Table 4, the majority of respondents reported that interview statement 14, "The planning process provided greater flexibility to those who operate educational programs, but at the same time made them more accountable for results," was not a description of what occurred. One respondent said, "In comprehensive planning we have that result ultimately but it is too far out to make a statement of that type." Other responses indicated that flexibility was limited to

TABLE 2

## FACTORS OF PLANNING PERIOD IN SCENARY 1

| Interview with participants:                                                                                                                                       | Interview Guide Questions self-rated |    |                       |    |                       |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----|-----------------------|----|-----------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                    | no exact description                 |    | a partial description |    | not a description     |    |
|                                                                                                                                                                    | Responses<br>Frequent                |    | Responses<br>Frequent |    | Responses<br>Frequent |    |
| 14. The planning process provided precise flexibility to those who operate operational programs but at the same time made them more amenable to results            | 0                                    | 0  | 3                     | 30 | 7                     | 70 |
| 17. Informal time was provided for staff members                                                                                                                   | 9                                    | 90 | 1                     | 10 | 0                     | 0  |
| 18. Much technical jargon was used in the planning process                                                                                                         | 3                                    | 30 | 4                     | 40 | 3                     | 30 |
| 19. The planning process revealed that the process or group of persons was more expert in the planning process than others                                         | 3                                    | 30 | 4                     | 40 | 1                     | 10 |
| 20. The involvement and intense determination of a large number of people created distrust                                                                         | 4                                    | 40 | 4                     | 40 | 1                     | 10 |
| 21. Participation was such in the planning process so that the results of earlier decisions could be evaluated in order to make more effective future decisions    | 5                                    | 50 | 1                     | 10 | 0                     | 0  |
| 22. Lower level systems in the educational system were involved in policy making at the upper level in those systems that would affect their policies and programs | 3                                    | 30 | 7                     | 70 | 0                     | 0  |
| 23. Participants in the planning felt that some planners could not be displaced                                                                                    | 3                                    | 30 | 4                     | 40 | 4                     | 40 |
| 24. Participants in the planning displayed a feeling of social equality                                                                                            | 5                                    | 50 | 1                     | 10 | 1                     | 10 |
| 25. Cooperation in the planning was genuine and free                                                                                                               | 1                                    | 10 | 4                     | 40 | 5                     | 50 |

the selection by the school district of a number of districts to be used in complying with the planning mandate. Certainly, this is not what the Florida State Department of Education intended when it adopted the previously mentioned official approach to the leadership for improving education which is, "to provide greater flexibility in those who operate educational programs, but at the same time make them more accountable for results."<sup>4</sup>

Indeed time was provided for the activity of comprehensive planning according to some of the ten respondents. A representative comment was, "Teachers were released and paid to attend night meetings, also conferences and workshops. Administrators were not paid."

The statement, "Much technical jargon was used in the planning process," drew scattered responses. One person said that this was usually the case, time agreed that it was partially true, and three said that it was not. The data indicate that the planning expectations in School District 1 did have communication problems which were in part created by the sophisticated vocabulary used in communicating to school and community groups the proposed format and activities for comprehensive planning. This would represent ineffective planning practice according to Gering and he urges school administrators to, "...use small words to improve clarity and understanding."<sup>5</sup>

The majority of respondents felt, in varying degrees, that the planning process revealed that the period of spring of previous year was

<sup>4</sup>McCallum, p. 70.

<sup>5</sup>Gering, p. 100.

expert in the planning process than others. Three of the ten respondents claimed that this was exactly the case and six saw it as partially so. The data indicate, however, that planners in Island District 2 did not see this discrepancy in planning ability as detrimental to the overall planning effort. As one respondent put it, "Planning is a process that requires technical competence but none of the things that go on are not technical. Planning needs some technical and some broadly based competence." Dunbar-Knight and Foster imply that such discrepancy in planning expertise may cause group problems, and agree with the rationale expressed by the above quoted respondent that planning requires levels of competency, but note that, " . . . where such specialization arises, the effective performance of the group depends upon the development of appropriate coordination between the specialists in their separation of labor and communalizing of view."<sup>1</sup>

Data also indicate that a degree of dissent was generated by the involvement of a large number of people in the planning process. Although three of the ten respondents claimed that no dissent was generated, six felt that the descriptive statement, "The involvement and intense interaction of a large number of people in planning created dissent," was partially true and one respondent said that this statement was very well descriptive. The comment from the "least" category was the most negative. The respondent said, "Yes, there is exactly what occurred: In-group dissent. There were some things that [the District-2/2400 Cooperative Educational Planning Committee] disagreed on that they agreed."

<sup>1</sup>David Dunbar-Knight and John Foster, "Leadership and Performance of Group Functions: Introduction," Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, p. 102.

With implementation of the general feedback, however, was the response, "There were differences of opinion but this was not undesirable." It is a good way to see that there are differing considerations. It did not create division among people.<sup>1</sup> Although dissent in planning may be, as indicated in an earlier chapter, a detriment to effective planning, dissent is the factor defined by respondents in school districts I would be inclusive according to Carpenter, she says,

Planning should be spontaneous and integrative and not discussed in terms of organizational interests. Planning and developmental work can also be persuasive, stimulating of vigorous discussion, and indicative of thought and action. These should be encouraged.<sup>2</sup>

Interviewees generally agreed that feedback was embedded in the planning process. Five of the ten respondents agreed that the statement, "revision was made in the planning process so that the results of earlier decisions could be evaluated in order to make more effective future decisions," was an exact description of what occurred and five said that the statement was partially descriptive. Feedback is an essential characteristic of effective planning according to many writers in the field. Rogers and Lyttle say that a process of continual evaluation of policies and strategies will "... tend to bring plans in the future."<sup>3</sup>

Question in interview statement II indicates that decisions

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Carpenter, "Building Education and Technology," *Planning for Effective Utilization of Technology in Education: Managing Change for the Future*, in *EDRS* (June 1974), p. 34.

<sup>2</sup>Donald G. Rogers and Sarah S. Lyttle, *Processes and Plans: Basic Principles and Applications* (New York: The Free Press, 1971), p. 212.

making in terms of comprehensive planning was decentralized to a degree. Some of the 600 respondents said that lower-level systems in the educational system were at least partially involved in policy making which affected them and these respondents reported that the lower-level systems were always involved. One respondent explained, "this [the involvement of lower-level systems in policy making at the upper levels] was done through representative groups and done through the Superintendent's Administrative Council . . . and the school board which is the elected representation of the community." Another respondent who felt that the lower-level systems had not been adequately recognized in policy making said, "Maybe some of the ideas will be incorporated into policies and programs next year. What happens next year will be the proof." Even though no respondents disagreed with interview statement 18, there was some disagreement as to the extent of influence on the development of lower levels in the system in policy making. However, according to the planning literature, lower levels should be involved in policy making at the upper levels, especially when the policies affect the lower-level personnel. Of this Furlong and Stimpert write, " . . . it is probable that a well-thought-out plan would be ultimately rejected by the 'minors' if they were not involved in its formulation."<sup>3</sup>

Some of the informants at School District B felt that there were some planners they could not disagree. Even though six of the ten respondents said that the statement, "Participants in the planning have some planners could not be disagreed," was not a description of what occurred,

<sup>3</sup>David B. Furlong and Milton F. Stimpert, *Strategic Planning for Educational Change* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1979), p. 207.

Interviewer comments illustrate the reality. One respondent said, "The teachers felt that they could not disagree that time shall we have said." Another respondent told the writer that teachers who had no opportunities of proposing would ask members of the community organizations to relay such information to the time of the comprehensive planning meetings as the teachers themselves did not want to verbalize their opinions in the presence of school-district administrators present. Such a planning atmosphere would not be representative of alternative planning necessary to Hartley she relates:

Participatory planning involves the participation of all personnel . . . . It provides a way to avoid complete "top-down" direction in which policies are accepted at the central administration level with little or no active involvement of teachers and officers who are affected by the policies.<sup>10</sup>

The twenty-fourth statement, "Participants in the planning displayed a feeling of social equality," also generated scattered responses. Half the respondents reported that this was an exact description of what occurred but two of the ten said that the statement was only partially descriptive and three said that it was not descriptive. The conflicting data indicate that for a significant number of planners, the planning atmosphere was not perceived to be completely democratic. According to Korten, such an atmosphere coherent with feelings of unequal social rank would inhibit communication.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup>Hartley, p. 11.

<sup>11</sup>Korten Korten, *The Making of a New World*. (New York: Bantam, 1980), p. 116.

Conflicting data were also recorded for individual statements in this section. "Cooperation in the planning was previous and less rich." Three of the respondents indicated that the planning process was characterized by genuine good-faith cooperation but four saw this as only partially so and three of the two said that it was not the case. However, as indicated in an earlier chapter, Murphy was an essential such good-faith cooperation.<sup>18</sup>

### State Role in Comprehensive Planning

Guidelines for District Comprehensive Educational Planning was another of favorably by respondents. Guidelines was credited with increasing the systematic approach to planning taken by School District I including the more structured manner, the concern with district-wide philosophy, and the continued relationship between the budget and the program. The increased use of baseline data and community involvement was also positively influenced by Guidelines. Several respondents revealed the writer that School District I had participated with the Florida State Department of Education in drafting Guidelines.

Perceptions of the usefulness of the regional comprehensive planning seminars were quite different. Respondents reported the seminars were of little use. Although planning models were presented at these seminars, planners in School District I said that these new models were little explanation. One respondent commented, "we added more to the confusion than we saved." Another reported that little information beyond

<sup>18</sup>Murphy, Functional Organization and Administration, p. 181.

that in Guidelines, it was not available to the students. One school official said that their participation in the seminars was stimulated by curiosity of attendance rather than by a need for counsel in comprehensive planning.

Writings by School District # by Florida State Department of Education personnel concerned with comprehensive planning were also reported to be of little use. None of the respondents would specifically identify any contributions made by these studies. The data indicate that improved planning in School District # preceded their planning experience as superior to that of the Department of Education. One respondent stated, "They [the Department of Education officials] were more in need of comprehensive planning information than we were."

They noted that role they would like for the Florida State Department of Education to play in comprehensive planning, respondents spoke of such roles as advisory roles, not consulting roles. One respondent said, "If they are going to play a role in comprehensive planning, they need to tell some expert planners to their staff." Another commented, "The role of the Department of Education should be in the interpretation of legislation and in the setting of policy." In general, respondents see no lesser or greater role for the Florida State Department of Education than the role that they were perceived to have which was basically supportive, and advisory.

At the close of the interview one respondent offered this comment.

The major thrust was for involvement of community people in a long-term involvement process rather than the production of a product. For example, the third year will not be such an analysis of progress

needs such as language arts, math, and science, but was interested in how community and staff felt about schools and their expectations for schools. We had to educate ourselves in community involvement. We had to learn about the community and they had to learn about the schools.

Another took the opportunity to say,

I think it is important to remember that this was the first year of implementation of a state mandated planning process. The planning had to be over played by the end of the fiscal year and the department of education didn't have Guidelines until November of the fiscal year.

### Planning in School District 7

School District 7 is a large school district located on the lower east coast of Florida. The population is distributed with 85.5 percent black, 11.2 percent white and no significant amount of asian.<sup>12</sup> The nation school year completed is 12.1<sup>13</sup> and the population has increased 8.4 percent during the past ten years.<sup>14</sup> At the time of this writing, School District 7 has enrolled approximately 120,000 students at 120 schools. The persons interviewed in School District 7 were: District Superintendent for Instruction, Director of Career Education, administrative assistant of a middle school, a teacher of an elementary school, and a member of a parent organization.

<sup>12</sup>Research Report No. 104: Population Characteristics of Florida School Districts, p. 19.

<sup>13</sup>ibid., p. 25.

<sup>14</sup>ibid., p. 24.

### Initial Activity in Planning

There was some variation in opinion as to what constituted the initial significant action taken as a result of mandated planning. Three respondents thought that the organization of a newly steering committee was the first significant action, one saw the communication to the school board that the meeting had been scheduled as the first significant action, and another respondent mentioned no first significant action, but reported that the organization for comprehensive planning had begun before the official action was received by the Superintendent. Data indicate that the Associate Superintendent for Finance had been working with the Florida State Department of Education in the area of comprehensive planning as a predecessor of the legislative mandate. Interviewers also recalled that subsequent to the announcement of the planning mandate, he was invited to participate on the State-Wide Task Force to develop Guidelines. However, data indicate that the ultimate responsibility for comprehensive planning was assigned to the Director of Career Education.

### Activities for Assignment of Responsibility for Planning

Several factors reportedly led to that assignment. The Director of Career Education was said to have been given this responsibility because he had mastered the division of labor in the making of short and long-range educational plans, because he had been asked to do long-range analysis of needs projections, and because he had a background in system management, and was a proponent of systematic planning. As indicated in the literature search, most contemporary writers in the field of educational planning would caution such rationale for

the assignment of the responsibility for planning. Jones, for example, in saying systematic planning is education says, "Replacing 'ad hoc' approaches with a planned systematic, rational approach for the director education should take has the potential of handling effectively the pace of change inherent in the future stock systems."<sup>24</sup> That the Director of Adult Education was usually given the assignment for the production of state reports and had the lion's share in the comprehensive planning project were also given as reasons for the assignment.

### Extent of Participation in Planning

From the responses to interview question 4 as reported in Table 5, the reader can see that respondents were in complete agreement that county-level officials, individual schools, members of the community, and teachers were involved in comprehensive planning. The majority of respondents reported that students and community organizations were also involved. Three of the five respondents agreed that students were involved and four that community organizations were. Additionally, all respondents agreed that business organizations and other issues were not involved in comprehensive planning.

The data indicate that the Superintendent was involved in several ways. The Superintendent's formal involvement was in the act of selecting the Associate Superintendent for Finance to participate in the drafting of guidelines. Upon the advice of the Associate Superintendent for Finance, the Superintendent appointed a steering committee to direct the development of a five-year comprehensive plan for the school

---

<sup>24</sup>Jones, p. 29

TABLE 2  
AREAS INVOLVED IN PLANNING DISTRICT F

| Interviewee Grade/position: | Response |     |    |     |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----|----|-----|
|                             | Yes      | (%) | No | (%) |
| 1. County-level Offices     | 5        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 2. Individual Schools       | 5        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 3. Members of the Community | 5        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 4. Teachers                 | 5        | 100 | 0  | 0   |
| 5. Students                 | 3        | 60  | 2  | 40  |
| 6. Employer Organizations   | 0        | 0   | 3  | 100 |
| 7. Community Organizations  | 4        | 80  | 1  | 20  |
| 8. Other                    | 0        | 0   | 3  | 100 |

system. The steering committee was composed of professional educators and a few lay citizens. The superintendent attended only the organizational meeting of this steering committee but he continued to be involved in the planning by the review of the reports and educational priorities generated by the committee. The superintendent named the director of Career Education as the chairman of the steering committee, and requested the committee to develop a vision statement which would indicate where school district F stood in terms of standardized test results, student and teacher attitudes, and various other such designations. In

addition to this, the Department created the committee to develop a process for short- and long-range planning, to begin its working long- and short-range objectives for School District #1, and to reflect those in a comprehensive planning document.

Local county-level offices were involved in the comprehensive planning by attending full-day and half-day meetings for one month at the beginning of the planning year, and in the discussions of the working committee which was named the Comprehensive Plan Working Committee. County-level offices participated in planning that resulted in the needs assessment questionnaire. They did this by providing information called for by the committee. For example, the Division of Instruction provided lists of course offerings and suggested needs needs of students, the Division of Research provided statistical data on student achievement, and the Division of Finance interpreted needs in terms of budget. All county-level offices participated in the writing of system-level objectives for one, two, and five years. This use of information in planning and finance would be consistent with good planning practices according to Hammer who says that the major contribution of systematic planning, "... is the focus upon multi-year programs and financial plans. . . ."<sup>17</sup>

Individual schools participated in comprehensive planning by examining the previously mentioned action document prepared by the Comprehensive Plan Working Committee, and developing short-range 11 and 1

---

<sup>17</sup>Richard Hammer, "Education and the Planning of Businesses," *Planning Horizons: Fiscal and Long-Range* (1979), p. 71

year) and long-range (5 year) goals based on the populations of their individual schools. The planners in these schools wrote goals in broad categories and not by instructional area or grade level. For example, general instructional objectives were written for vocational or technical education but none were written for the specific vocational or technical courses. In a like manner, no specific objectives were written for language arts, math, or sciences which fall under the general education category. Principals and school-level department heads jointly revised these objectives and translated them to grade-level divisions based on addition and deletion. These objectives were then modified by the English teacher and the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee into the three national system-level objectives for one, two and five years.

Very few teachers were involved in comprehensive planning. As one respondent explained, "We were afraid to give teachers another survey to fill out." Interviews also indicate that the objectives that were written at each school as a part of comprehensive planning were those in which stated by the building principal and one teacher from each grade level in quotes 2-4 to by principals and their assistant principals or curriculum coordinators in quotes 2-12.

Students of the community and students were only peripherally involved by reacting to questionnaires given to a county-wide student survey.

#### Comprehensive Planning Committee

Interview data indicate that two types of committees were formed to participate in comprehensive planning--the previously mentioned Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee and school-level committees.

Although principals were asked to establish committees of teachers, students and lay citizens to set objectives appropriate to their own school communities and rank the objectives according to priority, the data indicate that no students or members of the community participated beyond reacting to questionnaires, which as earlier indicated were of a county-wide perspective, and not related specifically to any school. The actual membership of these school-level committees was, as previously described, made up solely of principals, assistant principals, curriculum coordinators, and a few teachers who were usually grade-level heads or subject-level department heads.

The school district-level committee was appointed by the Superintendent. Recommendations were made to him from all school district offices, from elementary schools, middle schools, and secondary schools, and from general community organizations. From this list of recommendations, the Superintendent created the Comprehensive Planning Committee. The Superintendent intended that the committee would represent both lay and professional persons, however, three indicate that none of the laymen recommended participated in the committee activities and only one parent in the school district attended the meetings. Although the participation of lay members in educational planning is supported by many writers, the decision to involve STUD in planning is an important decision made by the Superintendent according to Mayer and Wilson, who say,

one of the more important decisions made by the superintendent is the who, when and how of the development of various staff members.<sup>14</sup> The full involvement of staff members in planning and program development may be an important factor in improving staff effectiveness.<sup>15</sup>

Data indicate that the school committee and the county comprehensive plan steering committee both functioned for approximately 18 months and both were told that their recommendations would be considered by the school board as advisory.

### PERCEPTION OF PLANNING FUNCTION

Table 10 reflects reactions to selected examples of effective and ineffective planning practices. The videotaped interview statements generated unfiltered responses. Ten of the five respondents thought that the planning process provided greater flexibility to those who operate educational programs but at the same time made them more accountable for results while one interviewee saw this as partially true, and the remaining two reported that it was not. One respondent claimed, "It was hard to hold people accountable for results." Another reported, "We needed more flexibility in some matters." To this latter statement, the Florida State Department of Education would agree. As reported in evaluations, "Flexibility is essential if local managerial responsibility and ability is to be maximized."<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup>Frank G. Meyer and Harold G. Wilson, *The Effective Superintendant*, Edina, Minnesota: Pennell Publishing Company, 1971, p. 23.

<sup>15</sup>*ibid.*, p. 243.

<sup>16</sup>*ibid.*, section 3, p. 15.

TABLE 30

## EXPERIMENTS IN PLANNING PRACTICE IN COUNTY F

| Interview Guide Statements                                                                                                                                           | Interview Guide Statement Response |                       |                           |                       |                           |                       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                      | Interview Guide Statement          |                       | Interview Guide Statement |                       | Interview Guide Statement |                       |
|                                                                                                                                                                      | no exact description               | a partial description | no exact description      | a partial description | no exact description      | a partial description |
|                                                                                                                                                                      | Responses<br>Percent               | Responses<br>Percent  | Responses<br>Percent      | Responses<br>Percent  | Responses<br>Percent      | Responses<br>Percent  |
| 16. The planning process provided greater flexibility to those who operate educational agencies but it did not make them more accountable for results.               | 3                                  | 40                    | 1                         | 20                    | 1                         | 40                    |
| 17. Increased time was provided for staff members.                                                                                                                   | 5                                  | 100                   | 0                         | 0                     | 0                         | 0                     |
| 18. More technical jargon was used in the planning process.                                                                                                          | 1                                  | 20                    | 2                         | 40                    | 1                         | 20                    |
| 19. The planning process revealed that one person or group of persons was more expert in the planning process than others.                                           | 3                                  | 100                   | 0                         | 0                     | 0                         | 0                     |
| 20. The involvement and intense interaction of a large number of people created dissent.                                                                             | 0                                  | 0                     | 0                         | 0                     | 2                         | 100                   |
| 21. Provision was made in the planning process so that the results of earlier decisions could be evaluated as well as to make more effective future decisions.       | 0                                  | 00                    | 0                         | 0                     | 1                         | 20                    |
| 22. Lower-level agencies in the educational system were involved in policy making at the upper level in those matters that would affect their policies and programs. | 2                                  | 40                    | 1                         | 20                    | 2                         | 40                    |
| 23. Participants in the planning felt that some planners could not be displaced.                                                                                     | 1                                  | 20                    | 0                         | 0                     | 4                         | 80                    |
| 24. Participants in the planning displayed a feeling of social equality.                                                                                             | 0                                  | 00                    | 1                         | 20                    | 0                         | 0                     |
| 25. Cooperation in the planning was genuine and from both.                                                                                                           | 1                                  | 20                    | 0                         | 0                     | 1                         | 20                    |

All respondents agreed that inclusion has not provided for staff members. One respondent said that this was a problem she had the impression that the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee was a " . . . high priority group." She further commented, "There times I was taken out of the school and given a substitute so I could go to the county-level meetings." Such provision for school-level staff to participate in professional school district-level meetings should be a part of the job of district-level administrators according to Lewis.<sup>20</sup>

The statement, "Such technical people was used in the planning process," also drew additional responses. One of the five respondents said that this interview statement was mostly descriptive and three others reported that it was partially descriptive. Only one interviewee chose the "not" qualifier. The data indicates that there were problems with terminology in the planning. As one respondent said, "At the beginning I was not having the Director of Career Education in very eloquent." Many writers in the field of educational planning feel that such communication problems will lead to insufficient planning. Speaking of the importance of clear communication, Wilson says, ". . . in the final analysis, the job of every manager or supervisor is communication."<sup>21</sup> He goes on to say, "Essentially he [the educational planner] must get

<sup>20</sup> Douglas S. Lewis, School Administration: Foundations and Principles (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1989), p. 26.

<sup>21</sup> George H. Wilson, "Managing Challenges and Images for the Preparation of Career Education," Preparation Magazine, 30, First Quarterly Issue: Educational Horizons for the Future, An Educational Review, 1982, p. 30.

work down through other people, and to accomplish this he must communicate effectively with them."<sup>23</sup>

All respondents agreed that the planning process involves that one person or group of persons was more expert in the planning process than others. One respondent said, "Definitely, that was why he (the Director of Career Education) was given the job." Another respondent said that certain people were more expert, and named the Director of Career Education and the Associate Superintendent for Planning Services. Although respondents in School District F did not perceive this discrepancy in planning ability as particularly disruptive, Hoffman and other writers see it as characteristic of ineffective educational planning. Hoffman wrote that, "An attempt by a central staff to regulate the program which often results in crude reports by the central staff which do little more than provide a limited education to those preparing the report."<sup>24</sup>

None of the respondents felt that the introduction of a large number of people in planning created dissent. One respondent reported on some rather lively discussions but said "Harvest" was not descriptive of the atmosphere. Another commented that the planning committee worked "harmoniously" and went on to say, "There were points of disagreement but no dissent." Even though the literature search revealed

<sup>23</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>25</sup> Robert F. Hoffman, "Strategies and Procedures in State and Local Planning," Planning for Effective Utilization of Psychology in Education: National Symposium for the Future of State-Local Planning, p. 126.

that problems such as discussed arise when large numbers of people participate in the planning process. Planning professionals also agree that even large school systems encounter such inherent problems. Murphy, for example, indicates that even large school systems deal effectively with the problem of size through sharing, "... to facilitate and apply talent to the solution of problems greatly exceeds that of small organizations."<sup>25</sup>

This also indicates that the element in process of feedback was a part of the comprehensive planning process in School District F. Four of the five respondents chose the "most" qualification of the statement in that effort, while only one responded in the "not" category. This use of feedback would be characteristic of effective planning according to many writers in the field. Carpenter says that planning is both rational and systematic, "... by developing and using all necessary means for avoiding and correcting for biases, lack of perspectives, un sound judgments, and faulty decisions of all kinds."<sup>26</sup>

District statement 21, "Lower level systems in the educational system were involved in policy making at the upper level in those systems that would affect their policies and programs," drew a positive response. Two of the five respondents said that the statement was an exact description of what occurred while one saw it as only partially descriptive and

<sup>25</sup> Edgar L. Murphy, "Planning and Educating Through Change in Urban and Metropolitan Areas," Planning and Educating Through Change in Education: A Practical Approach for the Future, An American Council, Edgar L. Murphy and Charles V. Spill eds., Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Press, Inc., 1983, p. 209.

<sup>26</sup> Edgar L. Murphy, "Planning and Educating Through Change in Urban and Metropolitan Areas," Planning and Educating Through Change in Education: A Practical Approach for the Future, An American Council, Edgar L. Murphy and Charles V. Spill eds., Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Press, Inc., 1983, p. 209.

the reasoning the use of is not descriptive. Even though the majority of respondents indicated that there was lower-level involvement in policy making, examination of the total data gathered in School District F indicates that, in this coming year of comprehensive planning, decisions and policies concerning the planning were generally made at the school district office-level without involvement or input from levels below that of county-office decisions). However, many educational planning activities encourage broad participation in educational policy making. Barkley, for example, writes, "... , planning succeeds when all of the members of a school system have an opportunity to share in policy making."<sup>27</sup>

Four of the five interviewees reported that all of the planners could be disputed or challenged, while only one respondent felt that there were some who could not. Data indicate that due to the opportunities for comprehensive planning in School District F, which made use primarily of school or school district office-level administrators, there was by this very fact created an atmosphere in which any participant could be challenged or disputed. The only interviewee who reported that some planners could not be disputed was a participant below the level of building principal.

Participants reportedly displayed a feeling of social equality in the planning process. Four of the five respondents said that this was exactly the case and one agreed that it was partially so. Even though social equality in School District F's planning was apparently

<sup>27</sup>Barkley, p. 155.

created by bringing together planners of basically similar administrative tasks. This too would be an option for expanding planning responsibility to district and town. They write, "Under this scheme [planning based on professional equality] the major partners are in the existing plan together, each equally important to the development."<sup>18</sup>

Cooperation in the planning was genuine and honest. This according to the majority of respondents--only one of the five felt that it was not. As previously indicated such good faith cooperation is essential for planning effectiveness essential to effective educational planning.<sup>19</sup>

#### State Role in Comprehensive Planning

Guidelines for District Comprehensive Educational Planning was not perceived as being of much use to planners in School District F. One respondent said that Guidelines was, "very broad and abstract." Another reported that the report was of some use in, "... setting broad parameters." Another said that other state reports were used more than Guidelines as the main function of the Department's Plan Review Committee was to compare School District F goals to state goals for the purpose of adding to and refining and priority selecting school-district goals.

Responses of the members of the regional comprehensive planning committee were also generally negative--one interviewee who said that the regional committee was of little use said, "they

<sup>18</sup>Farrel and Young, p. 109.

<sup>19</sup>Myer, Educational Organization and Administration, p. 107

Department of Education officials told us that some states and some of people who could help us but they as individuals gave us little help. They wanted to help but they couldn't." Another respondent told that the regional seminars were of limited value. "... because our own staff helped formulate state objectives and we were well aware of the content of Guidelines, and the intent of the Department of Education." Yet another respondent indicated that the Department of Education officials did not realize the regional seminars were not themselves sufficient in the elements of comprehensive planning -- as one respondent put it, "The Department of Education didn't have a clear picture of what it [comprehensive planning] was about."

Visits to School Division F by Florida State Department of Education personnel concerned with comprehensive planning also were perceived to be of limited value by informants. Data indicate that the visits seemed only to assure planners in School Division F that they were "on target" in satisfying the planning mandate. Although Department of Education officials were criticized with supplying information about the activities of other school districts in comprehensive planning, this was not seen as helpful. As one interviewee explained, "Our staff, on its own, had made itself aware of the [comprehensive planning] activities of other counties." Another interviewee explained, "They gave us no technical assistance."

When asked what role they would like for the Florida State Department of Education to play in comprehensive planning, respondents spoke mainly in terms of supportive roles. Data indicate that planners

in School District 7 would like for the Florida State Department of Education to supply that with some technical assistance by identifying and explaining alternative models for systematic planning, and by providing some assessment instruments that would assess "school" needs rather than systems. One respondent felt that the State Department should hold school districts responsible for meeting only the unique needs of the particular school district rather than placing emphasis on broad, state-level objectives.

#### Comparative Analysis of Comprehensive Planning in Two School Districts

From the geographic information presented at the beginning of each of these case studies, the reader can see that the two school districts under examination are similar in several ways. Both School District 8 and 7 are large school systems, both are located on the lower east coast of Florida, and both serve large numbers of students. From the data presented in the case studies, the reader is also aware that the school district office-level administrative organization is similar, and that both school systems are, in varying degrees, decentralized into a number of geographic administrative areas. Additionally, both school districts received official notice of the mandate to engage in comprehensive planning at the same time and both received the same type of planning literature from the Florida State Department of Education. The building organization and administration of comprehensive educational planning in these two large school districts was characterized by similar and dissimilar activities.

Responsibility in both of these large school districts assigned the responsibility for comprehensive planning to a school

District +Office-level Director) was. In School District E the assignment was given to the Associate Superintendent for Instruction, and in School District F to the Director of Career Education. The data indicate that the assignment in each case was the result of similar concepts of required personal attributes. The Superintendent in School District E reportedly assigned the ultimate responsibility for comprehensive planning to the Associate Superintendent for Instruction because of his position as head of the Division of Instruction, his membership on the Superintendent's Administrative Council, his experience and facility in working with community groups, the resources of the Division of Instruction that were available to him, and his participation in drafting ~~guidelines~~. The Superintendent in School District F reportedly assigned the ultimate responsibility for comprehensive planning to the Director of Career Education because he had retained the Division of Instruction in the production of short and long-range instructional plans, because he had been previously assigned to do long-range analysis and needs projections, because of his experience with and commitment to systematic planning, because of his involvement in the production of state reports, and because he had the time to do so.

Other organizational activities in School District E and F also had points of similarity. Both of these large school districts made an attempt to organize a working group for comprehensive planning that would involve community representatives with school personnel. The Superintendent in School District E appointed professional educators to what was to be called the Staff Advisory Committee for Comprehensive Planning and the school board appointed citizens from various backgrounds

and community groups to serve in that role to be called the Community Advisory Committee for Comprehensive Planning. The appointed membership of these two committees did turn throughout the initial planning year, but at the organizational county-wide comprehensive planning meeting, consolidated into one group thereafter called the district-wide Comprehensive Educational Planning Committee.

The Superintendent in School District F appointed one committee made up of predominantly staff and to a lesser degree business and community representatives which was named the Comprehensive Plan Financing Committee. The members of the school system who were appointed to this committee participated in varying degrees throughout the initial planning year, but only one individual person, a parent, attended these meetings. The committee was a collection of individuals, and did not significantly involve lay persons.

Although the Superintendent in School District E urged individual schools to organize comprehensive planning committees composed of community representatives, the data indicate that the lion of priority objectives reported from each school was prepared mainly by principals, assistant principals, curriculum specialists, and to a limited extent teachers. A few individual randomly selected schools in District E were asked to participate in comprehensive planning by providing a suggested format for writing comprehensive educational planning procedures for the following planning year. In actuality, the school district-level administrators did not use these suggestions until they had been interpreted and modified by geographic area superintendents.

Both School District E and F therefore made individual schools aware that comprehensive planning was taking place, but did not involve them

in a continuing or comprehensive manner. The data indicate that both school district E and school district F were engaging in systematic comprehensive planning while at the same time expanding activities below the school district office level which focused on related aspects of comprehensive planning.

The framework for comprehensive planning in these two large school districts can be described in terms of internal and external planning activities. Internal planning included those activities that took place in school district-level offices, and in planning meetings attended by school district-level administration. External planning included activities engaged in by individual schools and in some cases community representatives. These activities were assigned by or organized by school district-level administration.

Internal planning for school district E consisted of activities directed at producing system-wide philosophy and goals, assessing system-wide needs, identifying system-wide priority objectives, formulating a system-level program budget, and establishing the organization and procedures for comprehensive planning during the upcoming year. All system-level (institutional) areas participated by supplying system-level definitions of programs and inputs required to implement the programs. Every system-level division also supplied certain baseline and evaluation data. This information was ultimately compiled by the Department of Planning, a subdivision of the Division of Instruction, and reflected the program budget section of school district E's comprehensive planning document. This internal planning, although supplying information from all sections of all divisions, was accomplished primarily by the Division of Instruction and by a liaison school, the Division of Public Information.

However, planning in School District 8 was the structure by which business representatives and community persons were to be brought into a part of the comprehensive planning process. To accomplish external planning, the major participants in the previously described internal planning process, organized county-wide comprehensive educational planning meetings which were usually held at night in high school colliectives. At these meetings, lay persons participated in comprehensive planning within a framework created previously by the products of the internal planning process. The main function of the lay members of these District-Wide Comprehensive Educational Planning Committee meetings was to react to program information and baseline and evaluative information supplied to them by lay-level school administrative personnel. This external planning group was also charged with the responsibility of producing system-wide philosophy and goal statements, and with conducting a pilot needs assessment survey.

In School District 7 internal planning placed great emphasis on baseline and evaluative data, needs assessment, and the setting of one-, two- and five-year objectives. All county-level officials were involved in the planning by supplying for their areas lists of one-, two- and five-year priority objectives. The Director of Career Education with the help of the immediate supervisor for Financial Services, produced a document of baseline and evaluative data that was to give support and underpinning to the needs assessment survey aspect of comprehensive planning, and to serve as a complement in the writing of short-term and long-term objectives by indicating the continuing and changing needs of students in School District 7.

The data indicate that even though the suggested structure for internal planning in School District F included business representatives, community persons, and students, the actual implementation of internal planning did not include these persons other than by asking them, on a random basis, to react to a needs assessment instrument. External planning required that schools submit a one-, two-, and five-year priority objectives to board members to county-level offices for consideration. These lists in some cases represented the efforts of classroom teachers, but were mainly compiled and modified by school and geographic area administrators.

Both school District E and F made provision for school and community involvement in comprehensive planning in a manner that held them not only in an advisory capacity, but at a great distance from the point where actual decisions were being made.

The actual comprehensive planning documents that resulted from planning in these two large school systems were direct reflections of the organization and administration of the comprehensive planning. As indicated, system-level administrators in School District E almost exclusively and community persons in various material prepared at the system level and to administer a needs assessment instrument furnished to them; however, the only activity engaged in by these lay persons, that produced something other than comments, was the activity of preparing a set of system-wide philosophy and goals. The selection of priority objectives, the interpretation of needs assessment, the construction of the program budget, and suggestions for future comprehensive planning procedures were done by the internal planning group. As could be anticipated, the compo-

Internal planning devices represented the efforts of internal planners. In only one section—the "Philosophy and Goals" section. The remaining detail of the document was organized in the categories of priority objectives, needs assessment, program budget, and organization and process plans for future planning, and was almost the exclusive result of internal planning decisions even though external planners had reviewed and made recommendations concerning some of these sections.

School District F placed emphasis on planning in short and long-range objectives, needs assessment, and the gathering and interpretation of baseline and evaluative data mainly in terms of student achievement. Schools were allowed to participate in the planning only by compiling objectives and recommending them to internal planners. The resulting planning document became primarily a report of School District F's short and long-range objectives with no mention of budget allocations or of the findings of the needs assessment survey.

School District E and F were reportedly engaged in planning that, in varying degrees, combined effective as well as ineffective practices as reflected in the literature.

The majority of informants in both of these large school systems disagreed to an extent that the comprehensive planning process represented a balance between accountability and flexibility. Comments from interviewees in the two districts indicate that they were held accountable more often than provided with flexibility. Some indicate that released time was provided for planning in both districts. In School District E a few teachers were paid to attend the night planning meetings and, in School District F, substitutes were assigned for several school-based participants.

Administrators in both school districts were allowed to attend study-level meetings, but were not compensated for night meetings.

Both school districts reported some initial communication problems, however, which District F felt to be excessive. In a like manner, a substantial number of respondents in School District E and F felt that some of the planners were more active in the planning process than others, but again did not believe that this was disruptive.

Both believe that the selection of large numbers of people in planning created more conflict in School District E than in School District F. School District F, in fact, reported that no conflict was observed. A possible explanation of this is that School District E brought together a larger number of persons with diverse backgrounds in the extended planning that took place in the District-wide Comprehensive Educational Planning meetings whereas School District F planned primarily in the system-level Comprehensive Plan Working Committee made up almost exclusively of principals and system-level administrators.

17. The process of decision was a part of the planning organization in both school districts E and F but, neither school district was reported to completely involve lower-level systems in decision-making. Even though a considerable number of respondents felt that there was lower-level involvement in decision-making, other data indicate that decisions concerning integrative planning policy were made primarily by system-level planners.

18. Interview data indicate that a considerable number of persons in School District E were hesitant to dispute other planning participants, denied the diversity of view members of the planning group in

terms of their willingness to cooperate, and felt socially unequal to discuss other planning participants. In contrast, a substantial majority of respondents in School District F felt that any of the planners could be approached, felt socially equal to all planning participants, and agreed that cooperation was done in good faith.

Planners in School District E and School District F accepted the invitation to participate in drafting Guidelines. However, planners from these large school systems differed considerably in their evaluation of the effect of Guidelines on the organization and administration of comprehensive planning. Planners in School District E gave credit to Guidelines for the systematic basis of their planning, the needs assessment approach, the increased balance between programs and allocations, and the creation of a culture of less arbitrary decisions. Planners in School District F mentioned none of these benefits, and indicated that other state reports were of more help in comprehensive planning.

Regional comprehensive planning centers were said to be of limited use by both school districts. Respondents from these large school systems indicated that the regional centers served basically to explain the content of Guidelines which was information the planners already had and understood. Views by Department of Education officials were similarly described.

Respondents from both School District E and F recommended that the role of the Florida State Department of Education in future comprehensive planning should be interpretative and supportive. A comment from School District E implied that planning talent should be hired by the Department of Education and District F respondents included a request for more technical assistance, and for individualized guidelines.

### Chapter Summary and Conclusion

The data concerning comprehensive planning in School District I and School District F were discussed in this chapter. Comprehensive planning in School District I was a process totally concerned with the relationship between the program and the budget, and to a lesser but significant extent, was involved with needs assessment, community involvement, and future planning activities. School District F, in contrast, placed almost no emphasis on the relationship between budget and program, but was concerned primarily with the accumulation of baseline and evaluation data, and to a lesser extent, the compilation of primary objectives.

Both of these large school systems encountered problems in planning. School District F brought members of the community into a part of the comprehensive planning process which, to a degree, reflected planning writers who recognized parent involvement.<sup>20, 21, 22</sup> However, the atmosphere of the planning group consisted of citizens and educators seated separately to challenge the clarity of the situation, and make some feel socially inferior. Planning in School District F did not encourage

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 123.

<sup>21</sup> Opinion, p. 24.

<sup>22</sup> Opinion, Education Administration: Concepts, Problems, and Issues, p. 124.

group involvement, as recommended by many writers, El. No. 25 has also created a planning atmosphere of social equality and good-faith cooperation. This was, however, probably due to the fact that all of the planners in the system-level group were socially equal and could, without fear of reprisal, refuse each other.

Planning in School District E may well have been influenced by Spillings, even though the organization and administration of comprehensive planning in this large school system incorporated in the planning activities much of the suggestions for comprehensive planning found in Spillings.<sup>19</sup> Data indicate that planners in School District E had been experimenting with systematic planning and development procedures prior to the legislative mandate to engage in planning of this type, and influenced the thrust of the legislation as well as the content of Spillings.<sup>20</sup> In any case, most of the elements of planning in School District E are common elements.

Planners in School District F stated that Spillings had greatly influenced their comprehensive planning process. Data indicate that School District F was, however, influenced by Spillings, but incorporated the elements suggested in Spillings in a much lesser extent than School District E.

<sup>19</sup>Marling, p. 11.

<sup>20</sup>Harvey E. Marshick, "System Development in Educational Leadership Development Programs," Preparing Educators to Meet Changing Needs: Anticipating Education for the Future, AAAS-ASA-Educational Policy, p. 101.

<sup>21</sup>Marling and Young, p. 12.

School District E and F in a similar fashion recommended that the Florida State Department of Education play a more sophisticated role in cooperative planning by equipping itself to provide more technical planning assistance.

## CHAPTER VI

### DESIGN, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was done to determine how selected small, medium, and large school systems in the state of Florida organized and administered comprehensive educational planning in the experimental 1970-71 school year subsequent to the comprehensive planning statute passed by the 1970 Florida legislature.

The investigation focused on the following questions:

1. What kinds of initial planning actions were taken by the selected school districts upon receiving official notice that the 1970 Florida legislature had enacted and initiated comprehensive educational planning?
2. In what is the administrative hierarchy was the ultimate responsibility for comprehensive planning given and what personal qualifications were considered proper way to effectively coordinate the process?
3. What was the extent of participation of the various levels in the school system, and of the various segments of the community?
4. How committees formed for the purpose of engaging in comprehensive planning and how did they function?
5. To what extent were the selected school districts are going to effective or ineffective planning processes?
6. How helpful were the reports, technical assistance, and consultative visits provided by the Florida State Department of Education and what role is recommended for the State Department in future comprehensive planning?

The procedural design presented in chapter I identified the method of selecting school districts, the manner in which data were collected, the manner by which the instrument was constructed, the type

of data that were to be generated, the sources by which persons were selected for interviews, and the manner in which the data were presented. School district size was the criterion for selection. The two smallest, two mid-sized, and the two largest school districts in Florida were investigated. The data were primarily collected by personal interviews with persons identified by the superintendents and the comprehensive planning coordinators as being significantly involved in the planning process. The instrument used was an interview guide. All of the originally selected school districts agreed to participate and superintendents and comprehensive planning coordinators assisted the writer in scheduling interviews. From ten to ten interviews were conducted in each of the school districts. Persons interviewed included superintendents, school board members, school district office-level administrators, school-level administrators, teachers, and members of committees.

### Findings

Initial activities for planning in the selected school districts. The selected school districts initially reacted to the legislative mandate to engage in planning with a variety of actions. Although these initial activities could not always be sequenced into a clear-cut chronological sequence, the activities could be identified in three broad categories. The most frequently identified initial action was the appointment by the superintendent of a key staff member to coordinate and assume ultimate responsibility for the planning. Another initial action taken by several of the school districts investigated was the engagement of outside planning consultants to assist or participate in the in-house comprehensive planning workshope. Two of the six school districts studied used

school-district administrators be encouraged to participate in drafting state planning guidelines, and identified them as an initial and significant action resulting from the analysis.

Identification of persons receiving the comprehensive planning assignment and criteria for the assignment. In the majority of the school districts studied, the ultimate responsibility for the organization and administration of comprehensive planning was assigned to an immediate subordinate to the superintendent who was in charge of, or closely affiliated with, the instructional program. These school districts were assigned the responsibility for planning in most cases because of their involvement or control of the instructional division in the school district, their face-to-face contact with the schools, their previous involvement in the preparation of documents required by the State Department of Education, and their experience in working with community groups.

Extent of participation in planning. The planning that led to the production of the comprehensive planning document involved school system-level offices in all of the selected school districts. In each of these school districts, one school system-level office or division was responsible for coordinating the planning for the entire school district. Usually this was the division with instructional expertise. Other system-level offices participated mainly by supplying requested information to the coordinating office in a predetermined format. In some of the districts, certain school district-level offices also participated by furnishing baseline and evaluation data to schools and community groups upon request. Comprehensive planning in the organizational (OPO-3) school year was basically a system-level activity. However, school administrators, teachers, students, and community members were involved in varying degrees,

teachers; this involved, participated mainly by constructing instructional-  
 area or grade-level plans, administering needs assessment instruments, or  
 by compiling lists of priority objectives. Teachers were not found to be  
 significantly involved in the planning in any of the selected school dis-  
 tricts. However, their scores on standardized tests and their reactions  
 to needs assessment instruments were considered by planners along with  
 other baseline and evaluative data. Teachers of the community were also  
 peripherally involved and participated by reacting to free and to formal  
 such system-level productions.

Comprehensive planning committees. Committees were organized  
 for the purpose of participating in the planning in most of the selected  
 school districts. In the majority of these school districts, the compre-  
 hensive planning committees were authorized by school administrators who  
 were given strongly defined planning assignments that required little  
 contact or cooperation with other system-level divisions. These assign-  
 ments were usually collected and coordinated into the district comprehensive  
 planning document by the member of the committee who had been given the  
 ultimate responsibility for planning. Because of this planning structure,  
 the number of system-level administrators who actually participated  
 with a comprehensive perspective in comprehensive planning ranged from  
 two in the smallest school district to possibly five in the largest  
 system. School-level administrators and teachers were, in some school  
 districts, represented by school system-level administrators under the  
 umbrella of "committees." School-level committees functioned mainly in the  
 production of instructional or grade-level plans, budgets, and objectives.  
 These were in most cases forwarded via the principal to system-level admin-  
 istrators, and appeared partly or completely in the district planning

document. Various' activities, when formal, were organized and directed by school system-level administrators, and, as previously indicated, dominated primarily by administering needs assessment instruments or by issuing or reports or planning suggestions provided to them by system-level planners.

Overview of planning practices. The planning process in all of the selected school districts was characterized by both effective and less effective planning practices. Selected representative planners did not provide more flexibility to those who were in charge of the educational program but it did make them feel more accountable for results. Planned time was provided for the activity of comprehensive planning. Planning terminology raised some initial communication problems in all of the selected school districts, and differences in planning ability were noted. In the majority of the selected school districts involved only a minimum number of persons in the planning, there was no problem centrally, associated with the control of large planning groups in the small and medium-sized school districts. Even in the large school systems, only a minority of respondents reported that diffusion was created in the planning groups. The provision that was made in comprehensive planning so that the practice of earlier decisions could be evaluated in order to make more effective future decisions was of the informal type. Most such feedback was in the form of verbal comment on earlier decisions or in the act of issuing and approving members of previous planning sessions. Decision-making concerning the organization and administration of comprehensive planning was done almost exclusively at the top administrative levels in the selected school systems. Thus, as, the planning atmosphere was more often perceived as hierarchical than cooperative. However, a small but significant number of

persons involved in the planning, reported that there were some planners who could not be displaced, felt that they were not socially equal to some participants, and were not convinced that cooperation in all cases was genuine and in good faith.

State influence and role in comprehensive planning. Although the state report, Guidelines for District Comprehensive Educational Planning was drafted through the efforts of school board members, superintendents, school-district staff members, principals, and teachers from around the state in cooperation with Florida State Department of Education officials, it was still not well received in the majority of the school districts investigated. School district-based planners, even those who were involved in drafting the report, were not provided a strong planning focus by the Department of Education. The regional comprehensive planning seminars organized by the state were also reported to be of little use to school district planners. The organizers of the seminars attempted to inspect the planning guidelines in the school district planners, and provided the planners with sample planning models. As the school district representatives were seeking specific planning recommendations, and a clear understanding of what constituted systematic planning, further explanation of the planning guidelines and further exposure to complicated planning models was of little use. The visits to school districts by State Department of Education personnel responsible for comprehensive planning provided none of the same, and, in like manner, were not very helpful to school district planners. In some instances these visits served to confirm to planners that they were headed in the right direction in terms of satisfying the State Department. For planners who stated specific recommendations

level, the nation was not helped as the visiting officials were not able to offer support at that level. School district planners have recommended that the Florida State Department of Education play a more affirmative role in comprehensive planning. School system planners urge the Department of Education to develop or employ considerable knowledgeable in the concepts of systematic educational planning. They feel that the Department of Education should provide more specific planning guidelines, and even one reliable example to school districts as a practical context that they have in the past. A significant number of planners in the state desire that the State Department of Education monitor the implementation of comprehensive planning to see that the plans are implemented as written. Local educational planners requested that the Department of Education continue to play advisory, supervisory, supportive, and consultative roles, but urge that it develop genuine competencies for these functions.

### Discussion

The findings of the study represent investigation of six selected school districts and, therefore, caution should be taken in making generalizations concerning all of Florida school districts. However, there is no reason to believe that these selected school districts are atypical.

The full potential that could have been realized from the planning process was not realized in any of the school districts investigated. In this era of accountability, when the legislators and the general public are skeptical of the problems of education, and are demanding serious returns for the dollars put into schools, educational planners should become more of an integral in the most effective kinds of planning activities.

There is wide agreement in both literature and legislation that comprehensive educational planning with its emphasis on needs assessment, cost-effectiveness analysis, long-range perspective, and broad-based involvement is the only alternative for educational planners charged with the responsibility of providing effective educational programs with scarce resources. This study was undertaken to discover how selected school districts are guided in such wide demands. The intent is investigating the differences in the way the comprehensive planning programs were administered, based that such effectiveness in planning was being lost. These findings, and recommendations to correct these situations, are especially relevant to legislators, department of education officials, educators, and community leaders of this time. As a result of increasing amounts of state funding in Florida, effective local planning has become the primary method by which school districts can secure needed resources for educational dollars to spend.

Comprehensive planning was perceived as a high priority activity by superintendents. This was evidenced by the assignment of the responsibility for comprehensive planning to system-level division heads. Superintendents in the two largest school systems and school system-level staff members in thirteen to participate in drafting statewide planning guidelines, and at least half the superintendents of the selected districts requested outside consultants to help or participate in school-district planning workshops. At least three concepts of effective planning practices influenced these initial planning activities: (1) planning needs to be placed a place of prominence in the organizational structure, (2) planning needs to involve, in the drafting process, agencies and individuals to be

affected by the plan, and the personnel need to be involved in the techniques of planning. The data indicate that all school districts investigated would have benefited more from the planning activities if, in addition to assigning the planning responsibility to a person high in the administrative hierarchy, they had participated in developing statewide planning guidelines and had exposed the services of outside consultants to explain or participate in educational training courses.

Planners from system-level offices were the main participants in the comprehensive planning process in the organizational year and submitted their progress reports budget information to produce the comprehensive planning document. As previously mentioned, in the majority of school systems from two to five system-level administrators participated in constructing the planning document. Other system-level office planners are planning primarily in the perspective of their particular area and not not participating broadly in the planning. The writer recommends that the superintendent and all of his staff should have a global view of comprehensive planning and participate actively in a variety of planning activities. Superintendents should create and maintain a carefully functioning staff organization designed to insure the maximum utilization of planning talent. Clear-cut responsibility for planning tasks should not exclude the continued participation in a variety of planning activities of any school system-level office personnel.

Participation below that of the school district office-level consisted, in most cases, of planning activities carried on independently of the entire comprehensive planning process. These activities included the completion of priority objectives within the production of instructional

at grade-level class. These ill-effects were not significantly involved in planning activities with a district-wide or even school-wide emphasis. They were not therefore "comprehensively" participating in comprehensive planning. For the sake of efficiency, participation in comprehensive planning must be oriented; overall effectiveness in reaching goals is dependent by a structure that continues to involve principals and teachers in only their own operational operations and gives them little opportunity to become involved in all aspects of the total system. In such a planning operation, school-level personnel become so involved in their own specialisation that they are unable to evaluate system-wide plans except as those plans affect their own operations. Administrators are convinced that the dominant concept of the teacher is not that of an individual working in solitude within the confines of a discipline. However, specialisation does not create a new structure for planning, but merely extends the network already in existence. System-wide effectiveness will be increased if those who most implement the system plan are concerned in implementing it. When teachers are involved at the various aspects of comprehensive planning, they will develop a direct interest in seeing that the comprehensive planning document becomes operational. Total involvement of all segments of the educational system will produce very benefits including more productive inputs from: school-level stakeholders that have day-to-day contact with teachers and students of the community, teachers who are in close contact with students, students who are in close contact with members of the community, and community members who comprise the circle of involvement and are in contact with university personnel, State Department of Education personnel, and local elected officials.

Participatory planning is considered as a means of increasing the cost-effectiveness of school systems. However, participatory may take place in the context of or in relation to other generally accepted characteristics of effective planning strategy. School districts, for example, also have principal planning effectiveness by providing released time for planning to primarily system-level staff. Provision for continuous teacher growth in planning is a part of the job of system-level administrators. To ensure that and increase the effectiveness of planning, the provision of released time must be extended to teachers so that they can participate in cooperative, system-wide planning in addition to specialized school-related or instructional planning.

Many planners face the various school-related obstacles or perceived problems of communication in planning. Because of this, much time and potential are lost, especially during the initial stages. These communication problems were created by the complexity of school systems and the technology used in the various written materials used in school system planning. The writer suggests that the job of every administrator is communication. School system-level administrators must get work done through other people, and to accomplish this they must communicate. Additionally, an important part of systematic planning is the facilitation stage when administrators, teachers, and members of the community obtain most of the background information and objectives of planning by means of technical reports, and other inputs. The preparation of written narrative-style planning positions using simple words, short sentences, present tense, and straight order will improve the clarity and understanding of the planning information, increase the attention span of the reader, and thereby increase planning effectiveness.

Perhaps the largest loss of potential planning effectiveness was caused by the chronic and consistent lack of involvement of lower-level planners in policy making in the selected school districts. Determining necessary next aspects of comprehensive planning were made at the school district official-level. In the future, administrators should provide a structure that will allow and encourage broad participation in policy formulation. As previously indicated, to be most effective, decision-making in planning must be decentralized. Comprehensive planning that does not involve all levels in the system will result in sterile documents, costly to taxpayers and meaningless to educators.

The majority of participants in comprehensive planning in the experimental year were, as indicated, system-level administrators. They, for the most part, felt that the planning process was democratic, and that the cooperation in planning was sincere. This would be expected as these system-level planners were well organized and in similar status in the administrative hierarchy. However, in each of the selected school districts there were those who perceived the planning atmosphere as authoritarian, and doubted the willingness of certain participants to cooperate. Individuals who felt this way were university teachers and members of the community who had been allowed to play some small and predetermined part in the planning process. At school and community level involvement instances, administrators must take steps to eliminate professional domination of comprehensive planning. Authentic decentralization of planning and targeted cooperation will be viewed with continued suspicion. From now teachers and community leaders are raising hard questions about the present system and those who run it. Mutual trust and cooperation are necessary if comprehensive planning is to be effectively implemented.

The Florida Legislature mandated that school districts engage in effective planning, but for the most part left it up to the Department of Education to spell out the characteristics of effective planning. The Department of Education, with the assistance of a few representatives from school districts, provided all school districts with reports that suggested some of the activities inherent in systematic planning, but did not provide the question that many school districts needed to answer to engage in effective and productive planning. Planners in the selected districts only partially understood the characteristics and potential of effective planning and therefore engaged in a combination of productive and counterproductive planning activities.

As interpreted by the state Department of Education, the Legislature intended that comprehensive planning develop in each school district systematic planning and management procedures to improve performance. The vision articulated to the school districts that such improvement in education would be realized if districts clarified their goals and objectives, assessed and analyzed their needs, and identified alternative methods for achieving objectives. The vision further recommended that school districts include procedures that would relate input to programs, hold persons accountable for results, provide flexibility in planning, involve a continuous cross review of school systems and community expectations, and determine the overall progress of the district.

Even the largest school systems, which had been experimenting with systematic planning, were having problems identifying those procedures and modifying them to coordinate planning efforts. For example, some school districts planned attempted to assess needs, but even with

the help of professional needs assessment firms, found that worksheets and agendas had been assigned and not actual needs. One district participated with hired consultants in constructing and administering a needs assessment survey based on accreditation standards, and then decided that accreditation standards were not actual needs. Furthermore to revise budget, to prepare and persuade to involve teachers and members of the community were also approached in a trial-and-error fashion.

The intent of the legislature was that schools become more cost-effective. Cost-effectiveness translates into saving educational dollars. The State Department of Education contributed in part to the variety of inefficient planning procedures of the school districts by failing to supply the leadership role expected of it. School-system planners needed assistance in interpreting and implementing the variety of complicated elements of systematic planning. The writer is aware the State Board of Education has adopted an official statement of the state role in education. This role, as written, obligates the Department of Education to assist local school districts in the process of evaluation and requires that the department meet with various educational committees within the districts. At the time of this writing, various school systems have reportedly not received satisfactory support in their aspects of planning. Local planners have requested that the Department of Education go beyond these roles in order to effectively assist them with comprehensive planning.

Therefore, the state should redefine its role in comprehensive planning, and increase the potential of its dollars by developing or securing persons who can adequately assist local school district planners in broad based comprehensive planning aimed at obtaining the most for the educational dollars available.

The findings of this study indicate ways in which comprehensive planning, when done in the spirit of the legislation, may improve education, teacher status, school-community relationships, and provide more cost-effective education to students.

In this study we concerned with comprehensive planning in an organizational planning form immediately following the legislative planning analysis. Further research is needed to determine the implementation status of mandated comprehensive educational planning. Investigation needs to be done in a greater number of school districts and a greater number of interviews need to be conducted with a cross section of school and community groups. Research teams rather than individual researchers should conduct the investigations. Finally, it is recommended that the focus of future research should be on discovering the extent of school system and community participation in comprehensive planning, the extent to which effective planning processes are reflected in the planning structure, and the emerging role of the State Department of Education in the district planning.

SECTION 2.

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Time interview begins: \_\_\_\_\_ Time ends: \_\_\_\_\_ Total time: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title of position: \_\_\_\_\_  
School District: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Now, I am going to ask you some questions which focus for their purpose the dissemination of how your school district went about the organization of and participation in the state mandated comprehensive educational planning, a process which led for its product a comprehensive educational plan for your district.

Initial activity for planning

1. What in your opinion was the first significant action taken by your school district as a result of the legislative mandate to engage in comprehensive planning?
2. What in your district was given the ultimate responsibility for the production of the document or product that was submitted to the State Department of Education?
3. Which division of the county-level offices was given the ultimate responsibility for producing the document or product?

Persons for assignment of responsibility

4. Why was the individual that you identified in question number two assigned that responsibility?
5. Why was the division or group that you identified in question number three assigned that responsibility?

Extent of Participation in Planning

6. Did the planning that led to the production of the district comprehensive educational plan involve the involvement of:

|                             |                    |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| a. county-level offices     | Yes _____ No _____ |
| b. individual schools       |                    |
| c. leaders of the community |                    |
| d. teachers                 |                    |
| e. students                 |                    |
| f. laypeople/organizations  |                    |
| g. community organizations  |                    |
| h. others                   |                    |

7. If question number 6a was answered "yes," which country offices or divisions were involved and what were their functions in implementation?
8. Please comment on the nature or extent of involvement on the options of questions 6b, through 6c. Were you answered "yes"?

#### Comprehensive Planning Committee

9. What committee were formed for the purpose of developing an comprehensive educational planning?
10. If a village's committee(s) for comprehensive educational planning was formed, how was it done?
11. What elements of the community were represented on the comprehensive planning committee(s)?
12. How did the school system contribute to the planning that was done by the village's comprehensive planning committee(s)?
13. In what types of activities did the village's comprehensive planning committee(s) engage?
14. For what period of calendar time did the village's comprehensive planning committee(s) plan to function as a committee?
15. What was the commitment level concerning the nature of the autonomy of the committee(s)?

#### Review of Planning Function

See I as going to send a review of the interview statements. After made of these statements, please react to it by modifying it as "an exact description," "a partial description," or "not a description" of what occurred. With, if you want to further comment on the statement, please do so.

#### Comments of village chairmen

| Interview Guide Statements: | Interview Guide Statement Reflections                                  |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                             | an exact description      a partial description      not a description |

16. The planning process provided greater knowledge to those who operate educational programs but at the same time made them more accountable for results.

## STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL PRACTICE

\*Working with statements:

Statement with program objectives

| no | short | partial | full | description | description | description |
|----|-------|---------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|    |       |         |      |             |             |             |

17. Relevant data are provided for each number.

18. Such technical issues are used in the planning process.

19. The planning process involves that one point of view of persons are seen, report is the planning process that others.

20. The involvement and intense interaction of a large number of people around issues.

21. Forecasts are made in the planning process so that the results of smaller decisions could be evaluated in order to make more effective future decisions.

22. Lower-level systems in the organizational system were involved in policy making in the upper level in those systems that would affect their policies and programs.

23. Participants in the planning felt that some planners could not be displaced.

24. Participating in the planning displayed a feeling of mutual equality.

25. Cooperation in the planning was genuine and free flow.

State Role in Comprehensive Planning

26. How useful is your district's comprehensive educational planning was the State Department of Education's publication of Guidelines for District Comprehensive Educational Planning?
27. How useful is your district's comprehensive educational planning were the models scheduled by the State Department of Education's Region Comprehensive Planning Council?
28. How useful is your district's comprehensive educational planning were the visits to your district by State Department of Education officials concerned with the comprehensive plan?
29. Please comment on what role you would like for the State Department of Education to play in district comprehensive educational planning.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alamo, Lee and Hooper, Harold W. Planning and Social Change in Modern America. New York: World Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.
- Balchourt, Frank H., and Frohl, Albert. Educational Planning. Boston: Collins-Macmillan MacArd, 1970.
- Beverly, S. H., and Lowmeyer, J. A. (eds.). Educational Planning. New York: Macmillan Science and World, 1972.
- Birkley, David. Planning and Education. Boston: Brookings and Gaym, Paul, 1970.
- Brown, Fred S., and Johnston, R. P. "Planning and Problems of Planning," Public Management, May (April, 1971), 16-28.
- Cartwright, Evelyn and Barker, Alice (eds.). Group Dynamics Research and Theory, 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Coar, Edmund L. "Policy Analysis... a New Professional Role in Government Service," Public Administration Review, 1971 (September, 1971), 46-57.
- Deeken, F. F. Managing For Results. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Finkel, Boris B., and Young, Milton B. Managing Operations for Government's Service. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Florida Institute. ZIP Supplement. Tallahassee: State of Florida, 1972.
- Fordham, Milton. Florida Department of Housing Planning Model. Tallahassee, Fla.: Tallahassee State Department of Housing, 1972.
- Guidelines for Public Community Development Planning. Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Housing, 1972-74.
- Hirley, Harry J. Educational Planning-Experimenting-Modeling: A System Approach. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Hoar, Nelson B. (ed.). Group Dynamics For Public Policy Analysis: The fifty-third yearbook of the National Academy for the Study of Decision. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.

- Freeman, George G. The Budget Group. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- Gagnon, E. D. "Educational Planning." Educational Change, XI-XXI (September, 1970), 31-38.
- James, W. S. L. "Program Budgeting: Some on record." Educational Research, XI-XXI (November, 1971), 18-25.
- Jenkins, W. A., and Johnson, T. H. "When Politics of Power," School Management, VII (January, 1971), 3-6.
- Johns, Ann L., Alexander, Gary and Jenkins, Robin (eds.) Planning Educational Finance and Legal Administration. Columbia, Miss.: Oxford U. Press Publishing Company, 1970.
- Karman, Roger A. Educational System Planning. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Kearns, Stephen J. Program Budgeting. Elms: Berkeley, California; McGraw-Hill Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- Kerr, Robert E. "Educational Planning." AAEP Bulletin, VII (November, 1970), 34-36.
- Levine, Douglas E. School Administration: Problems and Policies. New York: Harper Press, Inc., 1971.
- Little, William E., ed. The Superintendent: New Trends and Challenges. Washington, D.C.: Association for Superintendents and Educational Development, 1969, 1970.
- Moyn, Frank C., and Wilson, David E. The Effective Superintendent. Milford, Michigan: Fordell Publishing Company, 1970.
- McGrath, J. H. Planning Systems for School Systems. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Publishing. 1971.
- Moyn, Robert E. "The development and implications of a description of leadership for school systems." Administration, University of Florida, January, 1971.
- Moyn, John E. "Program Budgeting: Some on knowledge." School and Community, VII (January, 1972), 34-35.
- Myrdal, Bertil L., and Jones, David L. (eds.) Planning for Effective Utilization of Technology in Education: Analysis, Research and the Future. San Diego: Holt Rinehart, 1971. Colorado: Westview Publishing, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Preparing Students to Survive Changing Change: Educational Research for the Future. A High-Rate Project. Denver, Colorado: The Claggett Press, Inc., 1971.

- Weyher, Edgar L.; Cohen, Lee L.; and Miller, Wendell L. (eds.) Administrative Innovations, Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1978.
- Weyher, Edgar L.; Cohen, Lee L.; and Miller, Wendell L. Administrative Innovations and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Weyher, Edgar L., and Ryan, Charles G. (eds.) Planning and Selecting Social Change in Education: Designing Alternatives for the Future as State-Plan Projects. Boston, Colorado: Publishers Press, Inc., 1971.
- Winkin, Brian and Brian, Norman. The Search for Alternatives. Washington: The George Washington University Press, 1978.
- Planning for Change. Tallahassee: Florida state department of education, 1971.
- Research Report No. 100: Population Characterization of the Florida School Enrollments. Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education, 1971.
- Werner, Donald C., and Winkin, Brian. Education and Education: Planning and Alternatives. New York: The Free Press, 1971.
- Wirth, J. Edgar and Buchanan, David L. (eds.) The Knowledge Society: A Systems Perspective for School Systems. Report 10. Toronto: Institute for Studies in Education, 1971.
- Wirth, Donald C. "The systems approach to education," Public Education Journal, 112 (September, 1973), 41-44.
- Yager, G. S. Options for Educational Planning: A Systematic Approach. Toronto: World Education Group, 1971.
- To Improve Learning: A Report to the President and the Directors of the Joint Study. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Instructional Technology, 1970.
- Yager, G. S., and Yager, G. S. Options for Educational Planning. New York: McGraw-Hill, Incorporated and William Morris and Company, Inc., 1974.
- Wright, John C. "Technological Planning: A Progress Report," Public Education Journal, 12 (January, 1973), 30-31.

#### EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Charles E. Moore III was born in Ocala, Florida, February 21, 1928. He received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida, in 1951, with English as a major and education as a minor. Subsequent to graduation, he taught secondary English for seven years and developmental reading for one year. In August of 1958, he was awarded the Master of Education degree from the University of Florida in the area of secondary school administration and was appointed high school assistant principal. He held this post until the winter of 1971, when he was awarded a post master's fellowship for full time graduate study in educational administration at the University of Florida. He has served two terms as president of the Duval County Council of Teachers of English, and has been a delegate to the National Council of Teachers of English. He is also a member of the American Association of School Administrators.

Charles E. Moore III is married to the former Fella Andrew Quarter of Jacksonville, Florida.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

  
Ralph B. Kohn  
Professor, Educational Administration

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

  
William Alexander  
Professor, Curriculum and Instruction

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

  
Eugene Tull  
Professor, Curriculum and Instruction

This dissertation was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

August, 1974

  
O. J. May, Jr., M. C. Butler  
Dean, College of Education

  
J. H. Smith  
Chairman, Graduate Council